



A priest of Pittsburgh, Pa., Father Richard Ginder edits *THE PRIEST*, *MY DAILY VISITOR*, and *The Catholic Choirmaster*. He is associate editor of *OUR SUNDAY VISITOR* and *THE FAMILY DIGEST*, and consulting editor for the John J. Crawley publications.

He holds a graduate degree in philosophy from the Catholic University of America and in theology from St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. A director of the St. Gregory Society, he is also a Fellow of the American Guild of Organists. His writings have been appearing in *OUR SUNDAY VISITOR* since 1939.

## *Right or Wrong*

Essays by Father Richard Ginder

Columnist for *Our Sunday Visitor*

Our Sunday Visitor Press

Huntington, Indiana

Nihil Obstat:

REV. EDWARD A. MILLER

Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:

✠ LEO A. PURSLEY,

Bishop of Fort Wayne

Printed and Published in U. S. A.

July 1, 1959

by

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, INC.,

Huntington, Indiana



The *nihil obstat* and the *imprimatur* shown above do not imply control or restraint where the contents of this booklet are concerned, nor do they imply sanction or endorsement. They indicate only that the manuscript has been read before publication by one who is competent and that nothing contrary to the faith and moral teachings of the Catholic Church was found.

## Twenty years of what?

ONE day around about 1938, says Martin Dies, "I got an urgent call to go to the home of a friend of mine in Washington because Justice Murphy had to see me instantly. My wife was present when we went to the home.

"Murphy was prancing up and down in a high state of emotional excitement, and I was at a loss to know what he wanted with me.

"Finally, he opened up and said: 'Mr. Congressman, I have sent for you to tell you that the Communists are going to take over this country. They are in our Government; they are all about us.' He was highly agitated . . .

"He talked like an insane man. My wife will tell you he would walk up and down the floor. His face broke into a sweat . . ."

This was shortly after Mr. Dies had called at the White House (at least a year before Stalin gave the nod for the in-

*The Priest, Aug. 1954*

vasion of Poland) to see Mr. Roosevelt.

"Mr. President," he said, "we must do something about this. Here is a list of many of these people. We have their membership records in a Communist-controlled organization. If you understand the Communists as I do, you will know that they are in the Government for one purpose and one purpose alone and that is to steal important military and diplomatic secrets and to transmit them to Moscow."

"The President," says Dies, "was furious. I was surprised at his anger. He said to me—he called me Mr. Congressman—he had called me Martin before—he said: 'Mr. Congressman, you must see a bugaboo under every bed.' I said: 'No, I never look under the bed, Mr. President.'"

"'Well,' he said, 'I have never seen a man that has such exaggerated ideas about this thing. I do not believe in Communism any more than you do, but there is nothing wrong with the Com-

munists in this country; several of the best friends I have got are Communists.'

"Mind you," says Dies, "that is a truthful statement. He made that statement." (This speech of Dies can be found in the *Congressional Record* under date of September 22nd, 1950.)

It's no wonder Justice Murphy was pacing the floor. We have an idea that many a one in a purple cassock was pacing the floor at the same time, and perhaps even one in a white cassock.

Our country has passed from "Several of the best friends I have got are Communists," to 1948 when President Truman remarked "I like old Joe (Stalin); Joe's a decent fellow," through the various "red herding" statements, on to "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss"—and now "McCarthyism."

The junior-Senator-from-etc. has denominated 1933-1953 as "Twenty years of treason." Let's have a look.

In 1933, industrially and militarily, Russia was one of the world's backward countries — something like China or India. Now they're manufacturing A- and H-bombs and we're frankly scared of them. What happened between 1933 and 1953?

It was in 1933 that F.D.R., reversing the example of Wil-

son, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, and profiting nothing by their considered and bipartisan policy toward Russia, gave diplomatic recognition to the Kremlin dictatorship with consequent social approval and diplomatic immunity to swarms of their agents.

Why had Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, refused to recognize the Kremlin gangsters? Because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was officially atheistic, had murdered millions of its own people, was running concentration camps, had abolished religion, seized churches, convents, monasteries, etc. Reason enough.

In 1939 Stalin and Hitler joined hands in the conquest of Catholic Poland. A year or so later, Hitler declared war on Stalin. For some reason or other, although both regimes were equally despicable, this country chose for its ally the State that was officially atheistic.

Regarding this decision, it is interesting to recall the observation of the late Senator Taft, made in 1940: "The victory of Communism in the world would be far more dangerous to the United States than the victory of Fascism." In 1940 this was not hindsight.

Throughout the war, strategy and tactics were constantly

shaped toward Russia's ultimate advantage — Churchill arguing on the side of the angels, General Marshall favoring the Russians.

(Everyone should read McCarthy's little book, *America's Retreat From Victory*, on Marshall's role in facilitating Russian occupation of Central Europe and the Balkans, and the fall of China. For some reason or other, this book more than any other brought down on McCarthy's head the frantic hatred of the liberals. The book was savagely denounced, but never honestly faced, much less refuted. It got the same treatment accorded Matthews' celebrated *American Mercury* article on Protestant clergy support of front organizations.)

In 1945, at Teheran and Yalta, our Government betrayed Catholic Poland to atheistic Russia. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Romania, Hungary, Albania and Bulgaria were included in the package.

Our troops were told to hold their punch so that the Reds could be first into Berlin. They were ordered to retreat from Czechoslovakia, Thuringia, and Saxony so that the Reds could take over in those areas also.

During those years the Administration was being advised by Alger Hiss; Harry Dexter White through Morgenthau, Jo-

seph P. Davies, who once said that "The word of honor of the Soviet Government is as safe as the Bible. Communism is protecting the Christian world of free men!"

Also forming high policy at the time was Dean Gooderham Acheson, who on November 14th, 1945, sat on the platform at Madison Square Garden with Corliss Lamont, Paul Robeson, and Albert Fitzgerald at a mass meeting in honor of the "Red Dean" of Canterbury. That night Mr. Acheson declared:

"There is the fact, for example, that never in the past has there been any place on the globe where the vital interests of the American and Russian people have clashed or even been antagonistic and there is no objective reason to suppose that there should now, or in the future, ever be such a place . . . We understand and agree with them that to have friendly governments along her borders is essential both for the security of the Soviet Union and for the peace of the world."

In the eastern half of the globe we learned that at Yalta in 1945, under the influence of his evil counsellors (Hiss included), Roosevelt had secretly turned over Manchuria to Stalin. He promised that Korea would remain free and independent. Nevertheless, at Pots-

dam later in that same year, President Truman ratified the Manchuria deal and also gave Stalin half of Korea.

Owen Lattimore kept advising the State Department to "Let South Korea fall, but not let it look like as though we pushed it." And that's just what we did. In 1949 our Government withdrew our troops from South Korea, leaving the natives naked before the North Koreans who, according to General Wedemeyer's report, were then being armed by Stalin.

On January 12th, 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced that the United States would not defend South Korea in the event of aggression. He might at least have kept his mouth shut, but instead of that he advertised the fact—virtually inviting Stalin to move in.

All this time, the liberals had been assuring the country that Chinese Communists were nothing more than "agrarian reformers"—this despite the frantic advice to the contrary of Christian missionaries and all other disinterested observers on the spot.

Of the actual conduct of the war in Korea, General Van Fleet wrote: "When I arrived in Korea on April 14th, 1951, to take command of the U. S.

Eighth Army, the atmosphere was tense. We had taken some bad beatings. We had managed to fight back, but now it appeared that the enemy was about to attack with tremendous forces and try to drive us into the sea.

"The next six weeks were the greatest in the history of the U. S. Army. We met the attack and routed the enemy. We had him beaten and could have destroyed his armies.

"Then our Government's high policy intervened, and we were ordered not to advance any farther. The stalemate began, and then the long and futile series of armistice talks. I cannot help but feel sad as I trace our policy downhill since May of 1951."—Was McCarthy really guilty of rash judgment in referring to Acheson as the "Red Dean"?

Strangely, public opinion has been tightly organized in support of all these blunders. Social approval was so intense that the publicist who dared to challenge the policies exposed himself to detraction, slander and ostracism. One was "responsible" or "irresponsible" according to whether or not one went along with these strange happenings.

Thus, John Flynn was always considered a topnotch reporter

and economist until he stood up to the New Deal.

Charles and Mary Beard were always mentioned with the greatest respect as historians until their findings clashed with predominant policy. After that they were through.

The liberals have seldom been right or, when they have been right, they have been right at the wrong time. A Catholic is naturally suspicious of them, viewed over the wreckage of the past twenty years. Their instincts seem to run against Christ.

In the '30s, when two totalitarian factions were slugging it out in Spain, the liberals sponsored the one side that was raping nuns and burning down churches.

During the past twenty years they have linked their sympathies so indissolubly with Communism that their screams of pain, as the investigative spotlight now focuses on the past, are all but ear-splitting.

In thinking of "innocent" liberals like Oxnam, for instance, who joined front organizations, remember that even during the '30s and the war years there were criteria at hand for sifting truth from falsehood.

The Communist record included the deliberate and literal starving of millions in the

Ukraine; the martyrdom of thousands of Christians; the systematic propagation of atheism.

Whatever the "innocents" may say, we know of not one Cardinal, Archbishop or Bishop of our faith who joined any group for the promotion of Communist objectives.

It was to be expected then that McCarthy would be persecuted as long as he persisted in confronting the liberals with their past sins and failures, for if there is a pall of fear over the country (as the liberals say there is), it is the fear of those with guilty consciences; it would certainly be ridiculous to contend that McCarthy brought about any limitation in freedom of speech.

But now, in 1954, the liberals would like to bury their past mistakes. They were wrong—horribly wrong—on the crucial issue of our generation. But they put so much emotion and intellectual energy behind Communism that now, their ideal shattered, they are faced with total spiritual bankruptcy.

Refusing to admit their own partnership in the crime, they have turned to hatred of McCarthy as a substitute for devotion to Communism.

Their pretended scandal at the Senator's allegedly immoral methods is a patent fraud. For



when it was pointed out to the nation that Roosevelt had secured his election in 1940 by lying to the electorate (e.g., "Again and again and again I tell you: your boys are not going to fight on foreign soil!"), the liberals refused to condemn the immorality but condoned it as necessary: "Ah, but he had to lie for the best interests of the nation."

Neither is there any word of condemnation for conditions in the State Department which, until McCarthy began hammering away, must have somewhat resembled a slum in the cities of the Plain. Apparently lying and sodomy are not too wicked in the books of the liberals. It is this shouting at witnesses and humiliating of generals that must go!

Of course ours is a large and roomy Church—but why any Catholic would choose to run with this pack of frustrated Socialists and professed atheists is utterly beyond our understanding.

The really terrifying aspect of this whole thing, from 1933 to date, has been the practical unanimity of the mass communications media. It is as

though someone is sitting somewhere pressing buttons in a tower high over America, and then the radio, press and TV fall into line. Thus, "We are for the Loyalists and against Franco."—"Up with Russia."—"Down with MacArthur."—"Down with McCarthy." The unscrupulous and even falsified reporting, the refusal to retract proved error, the carefully controlled readers' columns, the slanted headlines—who dictates these prejudices?

McCarthy has called the whole period 1933-1953 "Twenty years of treason."

During that time we liberated one-sixteenth of the globe from the tyranny of Adolph Hitler and then turned over one-half the globe to Josef Stalin. What did Stalin have that Hitler lacked?

During those twenty years we have created a Frankenstein that openly brags it will destroy us. If it wasn't treason, what was it?

Twenty years of coincidence?

Twenty years of blundering?

Or shall we just wrap up the whole package and label it "Twenty years of diplomacy without God?"

## Why fear McCarthyism?

"COMMUNISM has won its victories in the United States, not in the countries it has conquered. Poland was betrayed in Washington through the counsels of Alger Hiss, Harry Hopkins, and others of their ilk."—Those are the words of Louis Budenz, a former editor of *The Daily Worker*, latterly reconciled to the Church and now working on the side of democracy.

We can believe that fact when we recall that among President Roosevelt's trusted advisers was Joseph P. Davies, wartime Ambassador to Russia, who once said that "The word of honor of the Soviet Government is as safe as the Bible. Communism is protecting the Christian world of free men!"

In trying to understand the motives of Senator McCarthy and why he is so warmly detested in so many quarters, we must make a brief review of our

country's appalling diplomatic blunders over the past 20 years. And as you read, keep asking yourself: Why?

Why, when our country had been forewarned by Adolf Berle, for instance, why did our diplomats, after rescuing one-sixteenth of the world from Adolf Hitler, turn over one-half of it to Josef Stalin? How did Alger Hiss arrive at such a high and influential position in our Government when, as Whittaker Chambers testifies, the administration had been warned of his treason practically as soon as war had broken out?

At Yalta in 1945, President Roosevelt secretly turned over Manchuria to Stalin. (Hiss was one of his advisers at the time.) The President promised that Korea would remain free and independent. Nevertheless, at Potsdam that same year, President Truman ratified the Manchurian deal and also gave Stalin half of Korea. Why?

Owen Lattimore was another trusted adviser of the State De-

partment. It was his advice to "Let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it." In 1949, our Government did just that. We withdrew our troops from South Korea leaving the natives naked before the North Koreans who, according to General Wedemeyer's report, were then being armed by Stalin. On January 12, 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced that the United States would not defend South Korea in the event of aggression. That virtually invited Stalin to move in. Why?

Our Congress had voted \$10-million in military aid to South Korea, but eight months later, by the time of the Red attack, only \$200 worth of wire had arrived. Why?

Remember, now, the liberals had been assuring the country that the Chinese Communists (the people now killing our boys) were nothing more than "agrarian reformers"—people interested in improving farming and farm methods—this despite the frantic advice to the contrary of Christian missionaries and all other disinterested observers on the spot. Why?

According to Major Hanley, 6,000 of our boys were found murdered by the Reds in Korea, their hands tied behind their backs with the same peculiar knot used to fasten the 10,000

Polish officers murdered by the Reds in Katyn Forest—which raises still another question: Why did our wartime Government suppress Col. Van Vliet's and Lt. Col. Stewart's report showing the Russian Government to blame for that Katyn massacre? Again (to leave the track for a moment), why was the *Amerasia* case slammed shut?

Of the actual conduct of the war in Korea, Gen. Van Fleet writes: "When I arrived in Korea on April 14, 1951, to take command of the U.S. Eighth Army the atmosphere was tense. We had taken some bad beatings. We had managed to fight back, but now it appeared that the enemy was about to attack with tremendous forces and try to drive us into the sea.

"The next six weeks were the greatest in the history of the U.S. Army. We met the attack and routed the enemy. We had him beaten and could have destroyed his armies.

"Then our Government's high policy intervened, and we were ordered not to advance any farther. The stalemate began, and then the long and futile series of armistice talks. I cannot help but feel sad as I trace our policy downhill since May of 1951." Why did our "high pol-

icy" intervene against the defeat of North Korea and dictation of a truce on our own terms?

Remember MacArthur? He sent a thrill of patriotism through the country and his speech before Congress was like a draft of fresh air through the fetid stench of insincere diplomacy. We all recognized him intuitively as a grand patriot of the old school. But he had to pay the price. He sacrificed his career to his conscience. For a brief season he was a hero. Then the newspapers got to work on him.

Are you still asking yourself why? How a nation that in 1945 was the richest and most powerful on earth could have been reduced in eight years to the status of a second-class power?

There was a man in Washington who kept scratching his head and asking himself these same questions—Joseph McCarthy, the Senator from Wisconsin. Like the rest of us, he was baffled but, unlike the rest of us, he was in a position to do something about it. He was a United States Senator. And he jumped to his feet and started swinging.

Immediately the newspapers jumped him. The Communists coined the word "McCarthy-

ism," and since then the Senator has had a "bad press." Why?

In the June 22 issue of *Life*, Whittaker Chambers discussed the very same thing. His explanation spoke of a "liberal neurosis." According to Chambers, the "liberal" is really an un-Marxian socialist working toward the establishment of a welfare state in this country. He is not a Communist, but he is mortally afraid that he may be mistaken for one. Hence his horror of McCarthy.

Chambers is right. And the liberals have occasionally had to join hands with the Communists to achieve certain of their objectives. Hence, in many cases, their record will not stand a too-close scrutiny.

But I would add still another element to the explanation. Let me use an analogy (it is not my own). Suppose the KKK moves into a community with some high-pressure organizers and starts peddling memberships. All the "important" people get taken in: the school teachers, the town council, the bank directors, the Ladies' Literary Circle, The Young Men's Tuesday Night Debating Society, and so forth. For ten years or so, everybody is all out for the KKK.

Then one day the scales fall

from their eyes and they see the KKK for what it really is: a pack of organized un-American hoodlums. Now there is a frantic scurrying to get out. Now no one wants to be reminded of the old days when it was fashionable to dress up in a sheet. It's downright embarrassing to admit that you were once duped. The climate has changed entirely. And do you think that the former members and sympathizers won't fight like so many wildcats to avoid having their record exposed?

So it was with Communism. The speaker at Catholic University's commencement this year recreates the mood in a few words:

"Who cannot recall those years when the Communist Party proclaimed its undying love for democracy and democratic methods? And it did so most convincingly. My own mail in that period contained booklets and fliers demonstrating any Catholic and Communist should work together for the improvement of the working classes . . .

"There was the day, too, when speeches from both sides of the aisle in Congress praised the brave Russian people for their resistance to Hitlerian aggression. The number of organizations formed for the pro-

motion of internal and inter-allied unity grew like mushrooms. Many otherwise prudent persons, with the American penchant for joining, affiliated themselves with a new group each week. I marvel at the small number of university people that, innocently or otherwise, got themselves involved in Communist causes at that time. I cannot understand how so many escaped."

The speaker was Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, University of Chicago political science professor and director of the Walgreen foundation.

What Dr. Kerwin overlooks—but what very few Catholics at the time overlooked—is the fact that truth is truth and history is history. Dr. Kerwin supposes that there are no criteria at hand to sift truth from falsehood.

No amount of pious cant on the part of the Communists during the war could erase, for instance, the fact of the forced famine in the Ukraine during 1933. We Catholics were just as anxious as anybody else to help win the war. We contributed lavishly of our blood and means, yet I know of no Cardinal, Archbishop, or Bishop who joined any group for the promotion of Communist objectives; and out of more than

40,000 priests I know of only one who got mixed up unwittingly in such a group and then hastily withdrew.

No—if we Catholics could not warm up to such Communist fronts, it was because we were too painfully conscious of our brethren, imprisoned, tortured and killed for their Faith by Stalin; of nuns raped, churches closed, presses seized, everywhere within the orbit of Communist influence.

But these facts, this same information was available to everyone in the United States. Why then should they rally and join so numerously in support of a philosophy so often demon-

strated as being intrinsically evil?

They have a right to be mortified, and they know it. And that's why they are out to get McCarthy by fair means or foul. They resent his delving into the stinking past.

As for me—I have nothing to hide. Have you? I didn't join any organizations dedicated to the advancement of atheistic Communism. Did you? That's why we should cheer for Senator Joe McCarthy. Besides, I'm curious now to know just who did join, and why, and to what extent he used his influence in selling out our country to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

## The United Nations

It is now generally conceded that the late President Roosevelt gambled with Stalin at the end of the last war. It was a heroic venture involving nothing less than the blood and sacrifice of millions of us Americans and our allies. We were in a position to dictate the peace, but Mr. Roosevelt staked all—gave everything to Stalin in return for the dictator's assurance of cooperation with the United Nations. It amounted frankly to a bribe on our President's part, in which Stalin got Eastern Europe, half of Berlin, half of Korea, and many other concessions.

At the time Mr. Roosevelt was a sick man. He was not "able" for Stalin. All his vitality was being used in combating the illness that finally carried him away. At his elbow was Alger Hiss who, we now know, was working for Stalin.

Such a gamble would hardly have worked with even so civilized a gentleman as Win-

ston Churchill. But with Stalin as one of the principal contracting parties, the proposition was doomed to still-birth.

Let's look at the record from the Catholic-Christian point of view. Let's remember too that it is God who rules nations and governs their destinies, who alone can assure a lasting peace. There is no other realistic point of view.

The United Nations was first presided over by the convicted Communist spy Alger Hiss. The name of God is not mentioned in its charter or in any of its official publications. The greatest enemy of Christianity was given three votes in the UN (no other nation has more than one vote), plus the veto.

Three of the most Catholic countries in the world were barred from membership—Ireland, Portugal, and Spain: Ireland, because its great Catholic president, de Valera, led the successful fight in the League of Nations to oust Russia for invading Finland; Portugal, because its great Catholic prime minister, Salazar, is an out-

spoken foe of Communism; Spain, because its Catholic leader, Franco, is the only general who has defeated Communism on the field of battle.

Poland, a fourth Catholic country and the first to resist Hitler, was not permitted to sign the UN Charter at San Francisco with the original signatories. Hiss and Molotov forced Poland to wait until the Red stooges from Moscow had replaced the legitimate anti-Communist government of Mikolajczyk. Piously proclaiming itself to be an organization of "peace-loving nations," the UN also barred Finland.

At the same time that all these Christian countries were excluded, the UN embraced atheistic Russia and all of Stalin's satellites. Soviet Russia was admitted as a "peace-loving nation" although our Government knew that Stalin had committed one of the most heinous crimes in modern history: the massacre of 10,000 Polish officers in 1940 at Katyn Forest. F o r m e r Ambassador George H. Earle, also one-time Governor of Pennsylvania, later testified that President Roosevelt had ordered him to suppress the facts about Katyn Forest for the reason that "it would mean good-bye to the United Nations."

The UN has repeatedly tol-

erated Red aggression and religious persecution in its crudest forms. It condoned Stalin's seizure of Catholic Lithuania and Czechoslovakia, together with Latvia and Estonia, The UN never censured Tito's persecution of Cardinal Stepinac or Hungary's persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty. The UN welcomed Chinese Communist representatives at the same time that Red China was liquidating Catholic and Protestant missionaries and killing American boys in Korea.

The UN has persistently excluded God from its activities and undertakings. Although from the very beginning the UN could afford plenty of space and money for one of the largest bars in the world with tax-free liquor (Scotch at \$2 per bottle), it could find no space for a prayer-room until the fall of 1951. Unlike every session of Congress and all American legislative bodies, no UN Security Council or General Assembly meeting is permitted to begin with a prayer.

Although the UN is meeting in America and American taxpayers are paying 35 per cent of the budget, by demand of the Communists even our American delegates agreed to exclude prayer from its sessions.

Two prominent Catholic

statesmen, Senators McCarran and O'Connor, have led the way in exposing the motly assortment of U. S. Reds, Pinks, and Lavenders infesting the UN staff. When the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee called American employees of the UN to testify in the fall of 1952, 26 refused to state whether or not they were members of the Red conspiracy, and 12 refused to say whether or not they would be loyal to the United States in the event of war with Russia. They invoked the Fifth-Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Nearly all these witnesses were holding important positions with the UN, earning tax-free salaries ranging from \$6,000 to \$20,000 per year.

One of these, Alfred J. Van Tassell, an American drawing \$12,840 from the UN, told the Committee: "It will be a sad day when we don't include Communists in the UN. I see nothing wrong in having American Communists, French Communists, or any Communists." Another U. S. employee of the UN, Eugene Wallach, went directly into a \$9,000-a-year job with the UN from a position as an official of the Communist Party in New York, drawing a salary of \$100 a month.

David Weintraub, the \$15,000-a-year director of the UN

Division of Economic Development, about whom the FBI had made 43 derogatory reports beginning in 1943, testified that "it would not make any difference" whether a UN employee was working in a Soviet espionage ring.

Three witnesses, Frank Coe drawing \$20,000 per year, Irving Kaplan drawing \$12,000 a year, and Stanley Graze drawing \$7,500 per year, all refused to tell the Senate Committee whether or not they are *now* engaged in spying against the United States.

N o b o d y "indiscriminately smeared" these men as Trygvie Lie tried to claim. These Fifth-Amendment Americans fouled themselves by refusing to affirm their loyalty to their own country.

*(Don't forget that every true Communist is an avowed atheist, dedicated to banishing the name of God from the face of the earth.)*

Some of the auxiliary projects of the UN have been even more anti-Christian than the UN itself. A year and a half ago, it was revealed that UNESCO had selected three atheists to direct the writing of a three-million-word "definitive and unbiased history of mankind."

These men were given \$600,000 and five years to do the job.

One of them was Professor Julian S. Huxley, an outspoken atheist, who had been the first chairman of UNESCO.

Another UN agency, rejecting the Christian belief that man's rights are derived from God, has officially adopted the Marxian doctrine that man derives his rights from the State. This Commission has drafted the so-called Covenant on Human Rights giving UN approval to State regulation of religion and, in many parts, following word for word from the Constitution of Soviet Russia.

Although our Declaration of Independence and the Constitutions of 47 out of 48 of our states specifically acknowledge our dependence on God, this Marxian Covenant on Human Rights was drafted under the chairmanship of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, our American delegate. Charles Malik of Lebanon, her successor and a distinguished Christian, has charged that this UN agency reflects Soviet rather than Christian thinking. Malik said that a study of the debates in this agency will reveal "the extent to which the non-Communist world has been communistically softened or frightened."

It will be argued that we do benefit from membership in the UN, that our presence there serves as a "brake" on Russia.

But the disadvantages to our country seem to far outweigh those slender benefits. The UN has become a sounding board for Communist ideas and a focus of Red propaganda in our country. Our membership lends an appearance of endorsement to the godless philosophy reflected in all the activities of the UN.

As early as 1945, the Executive Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Hierarchy, said in their annual statement: "The (UN) Charter . . . does not provide for a sound, institutional organization of the international society."

No organization could be sound when its structure is riddled with Communists, atheists, traitors, and spies. The current pressure to admit Red China into the UN—and even to give her a place on the Security Council, with the all-powerful veto—is in line with the eight-year record of Communist appeasement within the United Nations. If Red China—which has murdered 7,000 handcuffed American boys and scores of Catholic and Protestant missionaries—is allowed thus to shoot her way in, then it's time for all Americans to demand that we get the U. S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U. S.

## A changed man?

ALL the free world took heart when in 1952 the Republican Party wrote into their platform under "Foreign Policy" that

"The moral incentives and hopes for a better world which sustained us through World War II were betrayed and this has given Communist Russia a military and propaganda initiative which, if unstayed, will destroy us. Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam were scenes of those tragic blunders with others to follow."

America shouted hurrah! and voted Republican.

In February of the following year, President Eisenhower followed through and practically denounced the Yalta agreement.

"We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to procure fancied gains for ourselves," he said. "I shall ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appro-

priate resolution making clear that this Government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement."

Speaking at the National Press Club in Washington on April 16, 1953, he called for "deeds" not "rhetoric" from the Soviet rulers.

The President is now halfway through his term of office and he has not yet asked Congress for the "appropriate resolution" promised above. Indeed, at his press conference as late as Dec. 3, he said that our final hope of peace is to lead the other side to "a little better understanding of the honesty of our intentions!"—precisely the blunder made by Roosevelt and Truman, assuming that we must first prove our own integrity before talking with the Kremlin hoodlums when, of course, the burden of proof is on them!

How explain the two years of appeasement?—of complaisance

before the problem of subversion at home and Red bullying abroad?—unless we are to believe the Washington correspondent of the London "Times" when he wrote home during the last campaign (Oct. 16, 1952):

"Yesterday one columnist reported that the General's old staff at NATO had been told by him before he left not to be alarmed by anything he might do or say during the campaign. He would do, he said, according to this report, whatever was necessary to get nominated and then he would do whatever was necessary to get elected. Once he was in the White House, however, he would be the man they had always known."

At the same time, Joseph Alsop was reporting that

"The General, now that he has left the Middle West behind, is going to talk like an internationalist and, once elected, is going to forget the McCarthys and Jenners and modernize the Republican Party."

Up until Jan. 24 one would have thought that the London "Times" was right. In fact, writing in the "New York Times Magazine" Section shortly after the election, William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the "Arizona Daily Star" had said that there was a "deep and latent urge in the

hearts of the American people" for a compromise peace, and Eisenhower had been chosen because he was less "stubborn" than Truman and was "about the only American able to come to an agreement with the Soviets."

Judging from current headlines, Mr. Eisenhower has finally been persuaded to act on what 140-million Americans could have told him all along: The more you knuckle under to a bully, the more he'll keep twisting your arm. Every schoolboy knows that you need only make a fist and the bully will run so fast you'll never have to use it. And you parents reading this—what would happen if your younger children ever got the idea that you were afraid of them? They would walk all over you. But as long as you maintain the idea that you're able to handle them, you'll never have to raise your hand.

It's as simple as that, and it's a psychological principle that operates between governments as well as between individuals.

However, with regard to internal subversion and Communists in Government, there is evidence that the President still does not grasp the seriousness of the situation. Indeed, it ap-



appears he never has. As John T. Flynn has remarked, "He is against Communism, but he doesn't know a Communist when he sees one." Hence his anger with Sen. McCarthy and his congratulations to Sen. Watkins.

One of the collaborators on Eisenhower's memoirs, "Crusade in Europe," was Joseph Barnes, then foreign editor of the New York "Herald-Tribune." According to the testimony of Budenz and Chambers, both expert witnesses, Barnes was a member of the Communist Party.

Under the headline "Eisenhower Angered By College Probe Plan," the New York "Star" of Aug. 18, 1948 led off as follows: "Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, last night vehemently denied that the University, its staff and its textbooks bore any taint of Communism." He told the reporter (Joseph Barnes!), "I found no trace of Communism among the deans, professors, and the rest of the staff at Columbia, and I have met them all."

(For sheer naivete that can't be surpassed. Did Eisenhower perhaps expect that the Reds would be wearing miniature hammers and sickles on their lapels as they passed along the reception line?)

Two members of his faculty—Gene Weltfish and Bernhard J. Stern—later took the 5th Amendment in testimony before the McCarthy Committee. But when the American Legion sent a delegate to discuss the matter of Weltfish, Stern, and other Communists at Columbia, with Mr. Eisenhower, he refused to see them.

As President of Columbia, to the consternation of Free Poles throughout the country, he accepted \$30,000 from the Red government of Poland to establish a chair of "Polish cultural studies." Dr. Arthur P. Coleman, for 20 years assistant professor of Polish language and literature at Columbia, resigned in protest.

Finally, Cedric Belfrage was press-control officer at Gen. Eisenhower's European headquarters. Today he is under a deportation order as an alien Communist.

It's an attitude of mind that goes away back with Eisenhower. His book tells how he insisted that the German armies surrender to the Reds at the same time as to us, lest the Russians "accuse us of bad faith"—when they had already violated the Yalta agreement almost before the ink was dry on it. But Eisenhower was still proud of this in 1948 when he was writing "Crusade in Europe!"

## Washington, Lincoln, FDR

EACH month I bring Holy Communion to a poor old paralytic in a cold-water flat and each month I must confess to a distraction. For as I leave the apartment my eye is inevitably caught by three medallions tacked on the door-jamb in a vertical series, uniform in shape and coloration: Washington, Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And then I go home and read in the paper that our national debt is now \$275-billion, most of it accumulated through having to arm the world against Russia, and that 70c out of every tax dollar is going for armaments.

Then I sit and ponder over what George Washington and Abraham Lincoln did for the United States as compared with Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yet that poor old lady thinks of him as one of our greatest statesmen.

Our Sunday Visitor,  
Feb. 13, 1955

She is not alone in her opinion. The American visitor to London is very soon impressed with the fact that Roosevelt rates with the English on a par with Nelson and Wellington. They have adopted him as a national hero.

(May I at this point insert a relevant parenthesis? Lend-lease to the British Commonwealth came to \$30,467-million, postwar grants to an additional \$3,652-million. For comparative purposes, our American postal service is crippled because of a daily deficit of a trifling \$2-million—so the whole nation must suffer.)

In Grosvenor Square they have a statue of FDR, head up, chin out. The first time I saw it I was puzzled. Why, he's wearing a cloak, I thought to myself—as in the famous Yalta picture. What an odd garb for a layman. The American male hasn't worn a cloak in a hundred years, and even today it takes a brave man to wear one



full-dress to the opera. It provided an interesting clue to the character of the man, and it recalled the testimony of Louis Budenz that it was easy for the Communists to get around the President by appealing to his vanity.

\* \* \*

We'll pass over the heady experience of entertaining the King and Queen of England at Hyde Park, the grandiose proposal to reshape the face of the earth in partnership with Sir Winston, taking over the whole Chateau Frontenac for days at a time, crossing the ocean in a battleship — any one of which should be enough to convince a normal human being of practical divinity.

We'll skip right back to 1932 when there were two certainties even before the inauguration: repeal of the 18th amendment and recognition of the U.S.S.R. With that the membership of the Communist Party was literally circularized with the news that the Great White Father had thrown open the gates of the Happy Hunting Ground and the Reds came streaming into the Government by the thousands. For them, as they told the unfortunate Dr. William A. Wirt of Gary, Roosevelt was to be merely a Kerensky, to be pushed aside at the opportune moment.

William Green of the A.F. of L. and Father Edmund Walsh of Georgetown, among others, warned the President against recognition, but he was guided instead by Secretary of Commerce Harold Ickes, who smiled on the Communists until his dying day; and by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, later to be a firm defender of Harry Bridges; as well as by his good wife, Eleanor.

\* \* \*

Now began the encirclement of the President. Among those with access to the White House were Mary Van Kleeck, director of the Russell Sage Foundation and, up until April 1, 1951, a sponsor of some 60 Communist fronts; and Josephine Truslow Adams, professor of painting at Swarthmore, who used to commute between Communist Party headquarters and the White House.

A Washington cell was organized under the aegis of Alger Hiss. Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, and Charles Kramer-Krivitsky were taken into the Department of Agriculture under the benign patronage of Henry Wallace. Hiss rose to power in the State Department, Harry Dexter White was the key-man in the Treasury, and Owen Lattimore engineered the Far East debacle.

By 1936, Communist head-

quarters on 13th Street in New York had a check on the President's most intimate thoughts and conversations. The Party supported him as "the lesser of two evils" and although Roosevelt repudiated their help, they pushed his election just the same.

It is a truism that the Communists exploit the weaknesses of their victims. One man is avaricious, another is sex-hungry, still another is a "boozer." And his predominant frailty is used to bring him to heel. With Roosevelt, says Budenz, it was vanity.

Mr. Roosevelt was to be persuaded that he could beat the depression, then become a great war President, and then trump Woodrow Wilson by founding the United Nations.

Writing in "The American Mercury" of last October, Budenz gives an instance of this technique as used on the late Representative Adolph A. Sabath, chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee.

"His weak spot, on which I and other Communists played," says Budenz, "was his pride in having been a member of the Knights of Labor, and I had to listen for hours to his reminiscences on that subject. But out of it all he did say: 'I have the utmost confidence in the Communists. You people know how

to defend the New Deal better than the New Dealers themselves.'"

Budenz also wormed his way into the confidence of Harry Hopkins by writing a series of articles on Hopkins' pet, the WPA—"the best I have ever read," said Hopkins.

This gave Budenz a chance to assure Hopkins of Stalin's perfect integrity and complete reliability. Such advice would reach the President endorsed by that devoted friend and patriot, Alger Hiss.

Lauchlin Currie worked from within the White House. All he had to do to place a man was to pick up the White House phone and say, "The Executive Department wants this." That's how he appointed Owen Lattimore advisor to Chiang Kai-shek, although it had all the prestige of a presidential order.

\* \* \*

Couriers shuttled between New York and Washington with instructions on how the President's mind was to be formed. Above all, he must be encouraged to top Woodrow Wilson. But first the war must be won and the quickest way to do that was by the invasion of France, etc.

In the meantime, other operatives were working elsewhere. Charles Kramer-Krivitsky was mentor to Senator Kilgore of

West Virginia, Lee Pressman was working on Senator Pepper of Florida, etc.

It was about this time that the useful shibboleth of "national unity" was devised. Earl Browder had been jailed for perjury in 1940. Now, in the interests of "national unity," he was released practically by executive fiat. Criticism or even honest discussion of national policy somehow became treasonable and dangerous to "national unity." Indeed, according to Ickes' diaries, Roosevelt thought he could even run the Pope in the interests of "national unity."

Between "national unity" and "national security" the President had things pretty much his own way. Remember how the investigations of the sinister mess at Pearl Harbor were rigged?—5,000 blue-jackets at the bottom of the ocean and no one allowed to question how they got there. Even Tom Dewey, the 1944 opposition candidate, had his mouth stopped in the interests of "national security."

Along with this went the great buildup of the President as "the Commander-in-Chief." Since he was a captive of the Communists, and since their way was his way, he must have his way. Budenz says that this Commander-in-Chief buildup

was largely a Communist achievement.

Through their own embassy as well as through White House informants, Party Headquarters on 13th Street had advance notice of Teheran and Yalta.

"It was almost like magic," says Budenz, "to sit in with an obscure group of men, such as Jack Stachel and Alexander Bittleman, unknown to the American people and never in the headlines of the press, and observe them dictate what the President of the United States was to do in his meetings with Stalin. It was equally amazing to learn later, with a startling rapidity, that Mr. Roosevelt was to do precisely those things."

Thus the President was persuaded that for the sake of peace the U.S.S.R. must have "friendly nations on her borders." (Additional "friendly nations" are still being shepherded within the Soviet orbit.) He adopted the catchwords "unconditional surrender" and "the punishment of the German nation." Eastern Europe must go to Russia. And China —? These were all policies that had been manufactured in the Kremlin.

The three captors of the President were Alger Hiss, in constant touch with 13th

Street; Harry Hopkins, the confused liberal; and Henry Morgenthau, dominated by Harry Dexter White.

Budenz concludes his article with the pathetic picture of the half-dying Roosevelt, in 1945, already well conditioned by instructions from 13th Street, be-

ing delivered to Stalin in the Crimea — with Alger Hiss standing discretely in the background: just ten years ago last week.

As I said, a man can have his own thoughts when he sees FDR bracketed with Washington and Lincoln.

## Evil and the facts

COMMUNISM is beyond doubt the greatest evil that has afflicted the Church of God since its foundation 1900 years ago. Since its triumph in Russia in 1918, it has waged savage persecution against the Lord and against His anointed, openly declaring its hatred of God and of His worship. In 37 years it has subjected one-third of the world to its tyranny, murdering and imprisoning its victims in the millions, using lies, torture, and bullets to achieve its fell purposes.

Communism is not a mere political party. It is a wicked and unscrupulous conspiracy to enslave the whole earth. It does this by outright force of arms, or by treachery from within the governments it seeks to overthrow. To the extent, then, that it captures control of a certain political party, labor union, or fraternal organization, it may be called "political"—but that is only secondary. Its first objective is

always to impose the rule of Satan.

Christ's interests are directly but inversely related to Communism. Every Communist success is a blow in the face to Our Lord, for wherever the Reds take control, Christ's shepherds are scattered, killed, imprisoned, His faithful are persecuted, His tabernacles rifled, His churches closed.

How then can any reader of OUR SUNDAY VISITOR cry "politics" when we essay a realistic discussion of Communism in these pages? How can anyone say that such discussion is beyond the purview of a church paper? How can anyone equate Communism with economics or sociology?

As we expected, our article commemorating the tenth anniversary of Mr. Roosevelt's cosmic blunder at Yalta stirred up a violent reaction. Also, and quite unexpectedly, the article giving evidence of an apparent softness toward Communism on the part of Mr. Eisenhower drew very little mail.

First of all, there can be no question of calumny in discussing FDR's role at Yalta. It is a matter of current history. The facts are an open road. In their day, they were spread over the pages of every newspaper in the land. The historian's plight would be intolerable if he were bound to report only the favorable circumstances of a world leader's career. History is a matter of getting in all the facts and then striking a balance.

Some few readers thought the reference to FDR's cloak was uncharitable. They associate it with his affliction. That was farthest from our mind. But even so the association is most unlikely. The writer has met many polio victims, but never one who wore a cloak. Have you?

And Mr. Roosevelt was so sensitive on that particular point that if he himself ever dreamed that a cloak was associated with polio, he would have been the first to heave it into the ocean. His public appearances and his publicity pictures always concealed or minimized his infirmity.

Many of the letters accused us of "politics," yet as we said, in our issue of Feb. 6 we were highly critical of Mr. Eisenhower, a Republican, and on Feb. 13, of Mr. Roosevelt, a De-

mocrat—complete impartiality on our part. Where is the politics?

Of those who come up for discussion, some are bound to be tall, some short, some Presbyterians, some bald-headed. Criticizing their attitude toward Communism does not thereby indicate that OUR SUNDAY VISITOR is against tall men, or is anti-Presbyterian, or that we have an antipathy toward baldness. That's beside the point.

The main consideration in every case is the man's attitude toward Communism. Has he advanced the Red heresy or, on the contrary, has he taken effective means to check it?

A great many of the letters could be summarized simply "Sir, You cur!" These people made no effort to face the facts. They might have gone over the article point for point, trying to show false information or faulty logic. They might have tried to show for instance that FDR did not recognize Russia in 1933, that he was not influenced by Alger Hiss, etc.

But instead they seemed to infer that the facts, although true, should be suppressed and it is somehow indecent to bring them up.

Five hundreds years ago, Machiavelli advised his Prince that if he found it necessary to

cut a man's throat, he might go ahead, but he must by no means confiscate the man's estate. In time, he said, the widow would forget or forgive the murder of her husband, but she would never forget or forgive the loss of his estate.

The truth of Machiavelli's observation was brought out in many of the letters received.

"Granted there are 5,000 sailors lying at the bottom of Pearl Harbor through administration bungling—but look! everyone has a TV set now!"—or, "Suppose FDR did guess wrong and dump millions of human beings into slavery behind the iron curtain—he kept the banks from closing, didn't he?"—or, "It may be true that 986,572 American boys died needlessly in World War II, but didn't FDR strengthen the labor unions?"

Mind you, they did not spell out their thesis in so many words. But it was involved in page after page of laborious penmanship which, completely ignoring the blood and gore of 1941-1945, concentrated instead of the glorious era of the full dinner basket.

It is evident that such people are guided by an inhuman and un-Christian set of values. Machiavelli had their number.

In the Gospel parable related by Our Lord Dives went to hell

not for what he did but for what he didn't do.

Similarly, we would consider it a grave sin to remain silent in time of crisis. It's the easier thing to do, of course—to paint the false picture of a rosey world in which there are no troubles, in which we can all just sit back and take it easy. That way you're not making anybody mad. But you're not helping anybody either.

It is mainly through controversy that one arrives at truth. Your editors scan perhaps 40 publications a week. Beyond that, we read dozens of books on current affairs for background material. But we don't cancel our subscriptions when we encounter facts that annoy us, nor do we fling an offending book out the window. For we must have both sides of the story to arrive at the truth. We take our facts wherever we can find them, and think them over, and ponder them, until we have an integrated picture. Then we sit down at a typewriter and pound out our judgments.

We are convinced that it will go hard with the Catholic editor on Judgment Day if he must tell Our Lord that although he saw the whole world going to hell he kept his mouth shut for fear people might resent the truth if he spoke it, for fear his

circulation might drop and some of his advertising contracts might be canceled.

That was the sin of Dives. He failed in his duty.

In sum, the battle against Communism is the field of every Catholic journalist. Archbishop Noll founded this paper 43 years ago to defend the Church against atheistic Social-

ism. In the meantime, an even greater evil has arisen—atheistic Communism.

Our crusade is not politics, sociology, economics. It is the defense of Christ against His enemies. It is the fight for the oppressed all over the earth. It will continue to be waged with relentless insistence in the pages of *Our Sunday Visitor*.

## To plug a leak

IN some parts of the Near East, if a man is convicted of stealing, they cut off his hands to make sure he won't do it again. Sometimes the feet are also amputated, since it is considered that they led the thief to the crime. The stumps of both arms and legs are then immersed in boiling oil to prevent infection.

By the Status of Forces Treaty, ratified July 15, 1953 at the direct insistence of the White House, our American soldiers and their dependents abroad have been turned over to foreign courts for civilian offenses. Thus, a French court recently sentenced two American boys to five years of solitary confinement for stealing a taxi while they were "high." In Japan, the wife of an American soldier is awaiting punishment for the accidental burning of her rented home. She forgot to turn off the electric iron.

Other cases include that of a soldier convicted in a trial

where he had not been allowed to put on his own witnesses; another soldier, sick with TB, was held in a damp underground cell; another, appealing his sentence, had it raised from ten to sixteen months.

It is hard to get information on just how many of our American boys and their dependents are in foreign jails. The Defense Department is very sensitive on the matter and refuses to give out detailed information.

For some reason or other, though, this Treaty does not include members of our State Department or those working for NATO. They are free to choose well paying jobs in the foreign service and they may quit when they like. But if they get into trouble with the law in foreign lands, they are hustled back to the United States for trial in American courts.

This, of course, is all wrong, and when you read of the Bricker Amendment, just remember that John Bricker is trying to stop this outrage. Our boys volunteer or are drafted

to defend the Constitution, but then just when they are most in need of that Constitution, they are deprived of its protection, and subjected to every sort of outlandish legal system under the sun, from Turkey to Japan.

But how can the Constitution thus be so easily set aside?, you ask. Only 20 years ago, a revolutionary decision of our Supreme Court decided that international treaties between our country and foreign states could be made to knock out the Constitution. Since then, the Court has extended this novel doctrine to include private agreements entered into with just a handshake between the President of the U. S. and foreign statesmen — executive agreements, as they are called.

The Bricker Amendment would put a stop to this, restoring the Constitution to its original position as supreme law of the land.

Its opponents say that it would tie the President's hands. And that is the precise point. Our President should have his hands tied—by and to the Constitution in accordance with our American system of checks and balances. Neither the Congress, nor the Supreme Court, nor the President, was meant to have supreme power in this republic of ours.

Senator Bricker says, "The argument that we should trust President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles not to make any dangerous treaties or executive agreements is wholly irrelevant. It was Thomas Jefferson who said, 'In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.'"

Opponents of the Bricker Amendment say, "Our President can be trusted. He won't negotiate any treaties that will jeopardize our constitutional rights and freedoms." But what about 1957? Or 1961?

No administration can guarantee what future administrations will do. The patriotism and the protective policies of one administration can't bind future administrative policy. Why not lock the barn door before the horse is stolen?

For over a hundred years, from 1789 to 1920, the provisions of the Bricker Amendment were thought to be a part of the Constitution. All through the 19th Century the Supreme Court kept asserting that treaties cannot authorize what the Constitution expressly forbids.

During the 19th Century we also find in Supreme Court opinions, statements to the effect that international agreements cannot be used to barter

away the sovereignty and the independence of the United States. But that door has been opened by recent decisions of the courts and, as a result, says Senator Bricker, "Many influential organizations and individuals now hope by treaty or by executive agreement, to make the United States a minor province in some form of world or regional government."

"Surely, no reasonable person can argue that Presidents were hamstrung from the administration of George Washington to that of Warren Harding. Or that the nation was not fully sovereign during that period. Or that the Constitution frustrated international cooperation between 1789 and 1920. Nevertheless," says Mr. Bricker, "those are the fallacious charges levelled against my proposed Amendment."

The plain fact is that the Bricker Amendment would merely reassert the safeguards on treaty-making which were a part of the Constitution for more than a century, safeguards that have been emasculated by the courts in fairly recent years.

Many level-headed Americans are behind this amendment. At their 1953 convention in Boston, the American Bar Association supported its adoption by the wide majority of

117 to 33. What group of American citizens is better qualified to evaluate the need for this vital legislation than the leading legal minds of the nation? Whence then the opposition?

According to Senator Bricker, who is in the best position to know, "The primary source of opposition to my Amendment comes from those who want to get the United States into some form of 'World Government' or 'Atlantic Union.' These people do not have the support of the American people, and hence they cannot obtain their objective by amending the Constitution. Most of them therefore believe that by treaty or by executive agreement, the United States should surrender its sovereignty to some world or regional super-state."

This would mean, of course, repealing the Declaration of Independence, since under any form of regional or world government, the United States would cease to be a sovereign, independent state.

Senator Bricker thinks that that is perhaps the most important reason for a Constitutional amendment, safeguarding our freedoms against treaty law and against individual law by Presidential agreement.

As a private citizen, in April, 1952, John Foster Dulles warned that "... Congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty-law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given the people by the Constitutional Bill of Rights."

Since then, Mr. Dulles has "joined" the government as Secretary of State. This may be the reason why he has changed his opinion completely and is

now fighting the Bricker Amendment tooth and nail.

But even if the Bricker Amendment were to be voted through Congress, it would still have to be approved by the legislatures of 36 States before it actually became a part of the Constitution.

Yet, oddly, opponents of the Amendment are fighting furiously against giving the American people any opportunity to accept or reject it.

They know that the common people are the only ones left today with common sense and that if the Amendment were put to a plebiscite, it would win by a landslide. So that's why they keep it buried in the Senate.



## America first—or last?

THERE is an influential and very determined clique in this country working toward a sort of "United States of the World" — "World Federalism," they call it. They point out how beautifully the system works here in America—Alabama on friendly terms with Vermont, etc.—and they think the same thing could be done on a global scale with all the countries of the world united under a super-government. Then the United States would be on equal and friendly terms with Egypt and if we had a difference, say, with Thailand, the matter would be ironed out on a higher level and so there would never be any more wars.

Anyone who opposes such an idea, of course, is called a boob, a chauvinist, an ultra-conservative still living in the past century—in fact, probably a fascist beast domiciled somewhere in the Middle West. He has never heard of H-bombs,

---

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
Oct. 16, 1955

jet-planes, and radar networks, they say. He is not a good Christian because St. Paul says we must not distinguish between Jew or Gentile, black or white. He is guilty of "exaggerated nationalism," so vigorously condemned by Pope Pius XI back in the days of Adolf Hitler.

Well, we are dead set against world federalism or any other "ism" that will put us under the control of any but Americans freely elected by other Americans.

Is it that we hate the English, or the French, or the Lebanese, or anyone else under the sun? Not at all! On the contrary, we Americans are the most "touristic" people on earth. We love to travel and spend our vacations in foreign lands. And let an honest-to-goodness foreigner come over here and we treat him like Hailie Selassie. We buy him drinks and take him to dinner and invite him to talk before the Kiwanis Club. We love aliens. In fact, we've been tak-

ing them into our country by the tens of thousands and offering them citizenship by means of our relief and DP programs.

But while we love England and France and Eire, we love our own country better. Is this evil?—or is it not rather the familiar old virtue of piety, imposed by the Fourth Commandment? What is the meaning of patriotism if not the love of one's own land above all others?

Christian charity requires that we give of our *superfluous* goods to our needy neighbor. The important word there is "superfluous." It does not require that we go into debt so that our neighbor may have egg in his beer, much less does it urge that we take off our own shoes so that he may have two pairs.

Apart from the momentous consideration of the national debt, there is the undisputed fact that we have vital needs at home which, apparently, Congress feels we cannot at present afford: roads, for instance, and schools. Is one being ultra-conservative if one suggests that these needs be considered before we debate foreign aid?

Bringing it down to more familiar terms: When we buy a house, we receive a "title," which we keep in our strong-

box. It is a legal document proving ownership. As long as we can produce it, we can't be dispossessed.

Now, much as we love our neighbor, we would be a fool to cut him in on our title. Some men think a long time before they go into joint ownership even with their wife! But suppose our neighbor's house burns down. We might invite him into our house and shelter him until he can make some permanent arrangement. But we still have our title, and if he becomes troublesome, we can throw him out. However, if he shares our title, we may come down some morning and find him knocking out the side wall with the idea of adding a rum-pus room, or changing the dining room into a grandiose powder room—and we would have no authority to stop him, since he is now part-owner of our house.

When people speak of "sovereignty," then, think of it as the title to our country. It makes us masters in our own house. We can go along with other countries on programs of one sort or another, but as long as we keep our sovereignty, no one can force us, and if the others play too rough, we can always just pick up our marbles and go home.



Entering into a world federation of any kind would mean cutting other countries in on our title—surrendering our sovereignty to a certain extent. Naturally other countries would love to see this, because they stand to get more out of it. Over there they drive little Austins and Volkswagens while we drive Cadillacs and Chryslers. They would be glad to make a 50-50 trade.

We insist that we can be good neighbors without handing over the keys to our front door. The internationalists apparently disagree.

We see no harm in foreign alliances, but it's possible to have a working arrangement with our neighbor without having him run your kitchen for you.

H-bombs? jet planes? radar networks? No problem. Things are working out beautifully as presently arranged. We have the use of strategic spots throughout the free world. Our troops and material there are protecting both them and us. What more do they want?

We have said it before and it bears repeating: There are worse things than death. Slavery, for instance—or a dishonorable cringing before the outrageous demands of a Hitler or a Bulganin. Father Rigney, just

out of Chinese captivity, rephrased it only a few days ago when he advised our soldiers to die fighting rather than be taken captive by the Reds. He said it's easier that way.

It is our unalterable position that as long as one free man—especially an American—is held in slavery, we should move heaven and earth to set him free, even if it means laying down our own life in the effort.

There is something about an American that speaks right to our heart. He understands the same values and lives by the same standards. He grew up in Eagle Grove, Wisc., or Salem, O., or Schuylkill Haven, Pa. If he didn't play on the high school team, he played in the band. He can talk about the Yankees and the Dodgers. He can distinguish a nutburger from a cheeseburger. He is as open and trusting as an airedale pup and so big hearted that the whole world takes advantage of him. He showers every day and insists that even his blue-jeans be immaculate. He is an American, and the very thought of such a patriot in the hands of the heathen is enough to make our hair stand on end. And while your Englishman has his own peculiar charm and the Italian his,

the American, with all his human dignity, has even more than that. He is a brother.

Is this nationalism? Certainly! Is it exaggerated nationalism of the sort denounced by Pius XI? Not at all! The Holy Father had his finger leveled at Nazism with its furious hatred

of the Jews (12,000,000 murdered) and the Slavs.

We Americans love everybody — but we're never going to be so foolish, because of that, as to fork over the title to our own country. We've often been played for suckers, but we're not that dumb!

## *Squeezing the taxpayers*

HAS it ever struck you as foolish and impractical to keep pouring out billions of dollars each year in foreign aid? — high-minded, perhaps, noble and altruistic, but then our elected representatives have never been especially distinguished for their saintliness and devotion to fraternal charity. Ordinarily, we think of them as hardheaded businessmen, or lawyers, with about as much impulse toward generosity as a money-lender.

Yet no matter whom we send to Congress or what campaign promises are made, foreign aid continues. Our country may be in hock for the next three generations, the budget out of kilter. We need roads and school-rooms—but first and before all we must put up those day-nurseries in Abyssinia and buy more tanks for Tito.

This problem always struck the writer as being quite as mysterious as Stonehenge or

the Greenlease Ransom Money, until we read an explanation by Howard Buffett in "Human Events." A Nebraska Republican, Mr. Buffett spent four terms in Congress. In 1952, he was active on the committee pushing the nomination of the late Bob Taft. He knows the story from the inside, and here is how he puts it:

"The year was 1948. Congressman Jones was eating a late supper in his apartment. It had been a long day in the House. The Marshall Plan of foreign handouts had just been up for passage for the first time. The phone rang. Answering it, his wife called, 'John, it's long distance for you from home.'

"At the other end of the line was Fred Smith, who had regularly raised the campaign funds for Jones' election victories. As he began to talk the pleasant expression on the Congressman's face faded.

"'Hello, Jones, this is Fred Smith. I'm calling to tell you to get yourself another finance

chairman for your campaign this year, because I'm all through working for you. In voting against the Marshall Plan today, you tried to beat me out of a big piece of business that was headed my way. I'm through with you.'

"'Wait a minute, Fred,' interrupted the Congressman. 'I didn't vote against the Marshall Plan. I voted for it. I just favored cutting it down several hundred millions so that it wouldn't be quite as big a load on our taxpayers.'

"'After all, our Republican campaigns have been based on the pledge that we would get national finances in order, haven't they? You helped me prepare those campaign pledges. We're in control now. Don't you expect me to try to keep those pledges?'

"Now it was the finance chairman Smith who interrupted, 'Listen to me, Jones. I'm not interested in your pious oratory about economy and cutting government spending. You recorded yourself in favor of a cut in the Marshall Plan. That reduction would have cut me personally out of between 25 and 35 thousand dollars of commissions each year, so I'm through with you. My friends and I aren't going to work again for anyone who takes our help and then works against

our chances to make some dough. Good night.'

Mr. Buffett avows it is a true story—and the Congressman involved was defeated in the 1948 general elections.

\* \* \*

The campaign on behalf of foreign aid is also pushed by means of the printed word. Mr. Buffett refers to a 33-page booklet issued by the Office of Information, Economic Cooperation Administration, entitled "Pennsylvania and the Marshall Plan," and subtitled "How U.S. Dollars Spent for European Recovery Aid Business and Employment in Pennsylvania."

Sample extracts: "Four Million Tons of ECA-Financed Goods Move through Pennsylvania Ports in 27 Months."—"Workers numbering 33,800 received a year's employment in 1949 through Marshall Plan orders . . ."—"Firms in 92 Pennsylvania communities get \$31,702,000 in ECA-financed orders in 4 months."

Eleven pages go on to list the different communities involved, together with the "benefits" received. The last page is headed "Pennsylvania Labor Officials Cooperate." Then follows a list of 30 Pennsylvania labor officials with their proper titles in the CIO, AFL, or UMW.

Analyzing the House vote on

foreign aid in 1955, Mr. Buffett finds that of 98 Congressmen voting from the six Eastern industrial states surrounding New York City, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts—support was 8 to 1 favoring foreign handouts: 88 favoring, with only 10 opposed. Over the rest of the country, the vote was about 3 to 2 in favor.

Apparently this is one issue on which Big Business and Big Labor have joined forces, with the politician in the middle. The Republican needs support from Business, while the Democrat needs support from Labor. But it's not really the politician who suffers. It's the taxpayer.

So as long as we continue to have pocket-book politicians and bread-and-butter patriots, we shall go on building day-nurseries in Abyssinia and buying more guns for Tito. Big Business with Big Labor is just an unbeatable combination—even though it is working against the best interests of the United States.

## ***Attention Mr. J. B. Matthews***

SOME two years ago, bedlam broke loose when J. B. Matthews came out in The Am-

erican Mercury with the flat statement that "The largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today is composed of Protestant clergymen.

"Since the beginning of the First Cold War in April, 1948," he said, "the Communist Party of this country has placed more and more reliance upon the ranks of the Protestant clergy to provide the Party's subversive apparatus with its agents, stooges, dupes, front men, and fellow-travelers.

"Clergymen outnumber professors two to one in supporting the Communist-front apparatus of the Kremlin conspiracy."

A case in point is a brief published recently and signed by 360 "notables," urging the Supreme Court to abrogate the Internal Security Act of 1950, sponsored by the late Sen. Pat McCarran of Nevada.

The brief tries to capitalize on the new friendship-line of the Red thugs following the Geneva conference. "They are not as wicked as we had always thought," it argues in effect, "so let's ease up on them." The McCarran Act, they say, is a far greater menace to our country than the Communist Party.

It is a typical "front" operation—not openly sponsored by the Communist Party, mind

you, nor typed out on their letterheads, but doing their work just the same.

Anyway, Mr. Matthews will be interested to know that of the 360 signers, only 94 can be identified as Protestant ministers; 87 are schoolmen and 23 are physicians.

\* \* \*

In the meantime, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Metho-

dist Church just got back from Hungary after accepting an honorary degree in theology from the Red-controlled Budapest Reformed Theology Academy. Bishop Oxnam is the man who joined over 40 front organizations without looking at the letterheads or realizing that they were Communist cat-paws. That's what he told Congress, anyway . . .

## *Plea for free discussion*

EVER since Adam got us all into trouble by biting into the forbidden fruit, mankind has had wars. Cain started it by killing Abel, and the human record has been a dreary history of violence and murder ever since. The cause lies basically in the wound inflicted on our nature by original sin. Our intellect was darkened, our will was weakened, and our concupiscence got out of hand. There will always be talk of peace programs, but we Catholics know that peace will follow only as each of us roots out of his heart the effects of original sin, and as the nations submit themselves to the rule of Our Lord.

But such a solution is beyond discussion among the non-believers. They see no sense in Christ. Trusting rather in their own wit, they have come up with some odd solutions.

In the first years of this century, the millionaire iron-master Andrew Carnegie saw a

panacea in a reunion of Britain with America.

"... You know that I am a race imperialist," he once wrote to a friend. "I know the day is coming when Canada, as the well behaved younger son, will take the motherland by one hand and the rebellious elder brother (USA) by the other and reconcile them both. I also think that Canada will some day annex the Republic just as the northern part of Britain, called Scotland, actually annexed the southern part, called England, and has bossed it ever since. May this be the destiny of Canada."

Elsewhere, "Some day the old home and the new homes, Canada and America, will again be united . . . Our race will then dominate the world and compel peace . . ."

To advance such ideas he set up the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace with the influential Nicholas Murray Butler as chairman. The Carnegie Corporation of New York advanced additional

funds, and the Church Peace Union received \$2-million in Carnegie money.

Other agencies devoted to propagandizing substantially the same objectives are the League to Enforce Peace, the Rhodes Foundation — which each year chooses the brightest of our American college boys for a free education at Oxford — the English Speaking Union, Sons of St. George, the Sulgrave Institute, the Pilgrim Society, and the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship (headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury).

To the great majority of the American public such a scheme is unreal. But we are accustomed to such things. Hardly a day goes by that we don't pick up our paper and read that someone wants all our children taught Esperanto, someone else wants to scramble the calendar, another wants free milk delivered — at our expense, of course — all over the world, etc. So we shrug them off.

But the quest for peace continues. Woodrow Wilson thought he had the answer in the League of Nations. He thought it was America's destiny to lead the way. Indeed, the mission was imposed on us by Almighty God. "The stage is set," he wrote, "the destiny disclosed. It has come about by

no plan of our conceiving, but by the hand of God, who has led us into the way."

Americans folded their newspapers and sat back to watch the League of Nations. It collapsed.

Next came the Kellogg-Briand Disarmament Pact. Now there could be no wars, for the nations of the world had formally rejected war as an instrument of policy. That was in 1922.

Then came the United Nations. President Roosevelt gambled the highest stakes for the success of his dreamchild. He was persuaded to make every concession to Stalin in the hope of insuring cooperation, at the same time allowing the wily dictator to implant the seeds of decay in the UN by insisting on the right of the veto, allowing votes for Russian provinces and satellites, etc.

Sometime in the past ten years we grew accustomed to seeing the name of a certain Clarence Streit in the news. He favored a sort of World Federalism somewhat after the pattern of the United States. "Another enthusiast," we thought. He was joined by a professional card-player, name of Ely Culbertson. "More of the same."

Finally, we observed a sort of sympathy with this business

in certain sections of the Catholic Press—although definitely a minority of the Catholic Press, we would say. And that's where we sounded off with our editorial of October 16, published here, in the Brooklyn Tablet, the Pittsburgh Catholic and since reprinted in other papers.

The response to that editorial has been enlightening. The mail was about evenly divided for and against. But the most bitter letters came from liberals. (A liberal in this sense may be defined as one who believes in a maximum of government — national or world — control over the lives of its citizens.)

All of these critics deplored publication of the article. With them there is no such thing as honest debate because, of course, there is only one side—theirs.

None of them met our exposition head-on. Instead, they contented themselves with denouncing us in general terms. We would have liked to read, for instance, their definition of patriotism in theological terms. We would like to see them cite authorities who assert that we are bound to go into debt to help others. But nothing of the like was forthcoming.

Although it was the fruit of four years' study and observa-

tion, our article was "flippant," presumably because, renouncing abstract terms and high-sounding phrases, we translated into short words and homely examples just what it means to tinker with our national sovereignty.

Their great effort was to wrap up the whole thing in statements by the Holy Father supposed to show that he wants a World Federation.

But we have studied these, too. The Holy Father is pleased with the good works of UNESCO. He has an observer at the UN. He wants some sort of an international confederation based on the Natural Law. This, of course, is precisely our position. UNESCO is to be commended for the good it has done. The UN bears watching. And an international confederation based on Natural Law is supremely desirable.

Nowhere do we find him declaring that the United States should join with any other country, nowhere does he say that our Constitution is in need of amendment as being inadequate. On the contrary, only last month *Osservatore Romano* gave high praise to the United States:

"We ask all whether it be true or not that in the human misfortunes of any nation, the United States has always been

present with prompt and conspicuous aid . . . whether the United States has not heeded cries for help in Italy and aided the flood victims of Polesine and Ferrara . . . whether the United States' flag, even amidst raging war, has ever been stained by infamy, or whether the American soldier has not left everywhere memories of human goodness."

We are defending a system of government that has enabled us to achieve these good works. We've had it for 169 years. It's rooted in Christian principles and it works. So why tamper with it?

A few readers pretended to construe our essay as an attack on Christian charity. This is malicious. We wholeheartedly favor foreign aid under private auspices; the Bishops' Relief Collection, the Thanksgiving Clothing Collection, the Propagation of the Faith, etc.

No doubt there are some who do not care to contribute. Shall we pass an Act of Congress and make them fork over or go to jail? Is this the meaning of Christian charity? Is it this that the Holy Father favors? Of course not!

Our apologetic for the American boy was hooted down as sentimental, "corney." Anyone on earth, we were told, should

mean as much to us as the kid next door.

Essentially, yes. All of us are children of God. We love everyone, but not equally. There is a legitimate hierarchy in our affections: first our family, then our friends and benefactors, then all our countrymen, then the stranger. Is this wicked, un-Christlike?—or is it not rather the logical extension of the Fourth Commandment?

But however we feel about matters, let's keep the debate open. We are all interested in guaranteeing peace, so let's not throttle debate by trying to canonize any one opinion and making it incontrovertible as though it were divine revelation.

Rather let us as editors and readers heed the advice given to West Coast editors by His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre. "You have," he told the editors, "a potential power that is not being realized. Newspapers cannot be neutral. They must have a policy. Right or wrong we do not admit of neutrality. A newspaper must have a policy which invokes the virtue of fortitude and couples it with temperance and charity."

The Most Rev. Robert J. Dwyer, Bishop of Reno and a columnist for his diocesan

newspaper, supported the Cardinal's remarks in his address to the editors. The editor's problem, he said, "is to understand the immediate relationship between the fact and the permanent reality, and then to overcome whatever personal obstacles may stand in the way of its exposition."

"If he (the editor) is by nature a liberal," the Bishop continued, "he must nevertheless be able to penetrate the illiberality of so much that passes for liberalism. If he is by bent a conservative, he must train himself to identify that which is faulty and extraneous in any given conservative program."

"It is to be feared, incident-

ally," Bishop Dwyer added, "that in the contemporary Catholic Press in this country, there are conspicuous examples of the opposite; of liberalism pursued and defended at all costs and in all contexts, as well as conservatism glorified into a permanent thesis of Christian dogma."

Bishop Dwyer said editors need the virtue of Prudence, and he defined it: "It is the high art of seeing all things in their exact proportion so that the truth itself emerges without sham, without subterfuge and without exaggeration."

And now please do us the favor of going back and re-reading our first paragraph.

## That 'pall of fear'

"I DON'T see why you are forever concerned about the anti-anti-Communists," an old friend wrote to me recently. "If you had not got that scholarship to Duquesne you might just as likely have gone to Pitt with all the rest of us and joined the League Against War and Fascism and maybe even the Young Communists' League. I could take the Pitt yearbook for the year I graduated and go right down the line on all the students who were members of Red fronts."

But my friend is wrong. He didn't join any Red fronts and neither did any other intelligent Catholic in our crowd. At that time we were held in fascinated horror by the Soviet anti-God campaign then being waged in Russia. Shortly afterward the Spanish Civil War broke out and we studied reports of churches burned, priests crucified, and nuns raped by the Communists.

There is no one who just slipped into Communist associations. They went too deeply against the grain, against natural law, against everything that we had been taught to appreciate as fine and decent. Every single front-member, in his moment of final decision, took a long last look at the American Constitution and then kissed it off in favor of a Soviet dictatorship.

And, make no mistake, there are tens of thousands who made precisely that commitment. In the words of James A. Wechsler, an ex-Communist now editing the *Liberal New York Post*:

"Faith in Soviet Russia was the grand illusion of American liberalism—It was in the mid-thirties when for the first time in American history the Communist Party influenced the nation's intellectual climate."

And, says Fred Rodell, Liberal Yale professor, in the *Progressive*:

"Back in the middle and late 1930s—the line between the

*Our Sunday Visitor*,  
April 7, 1957



Communists and the non-Communist liberals was sometimes, on the surface, paper thin."

Testifying lately before a Senate Subcommittee, Josephine Truslow Adams, a former teacher at the Communist Party's Jefferson School in New York, said that she had served as an intermediary on visits to President Roosevelt "approximately 38 or 40 times . . . It was at Hyde Park as often as at the White House." The contact was made through the President's wife, she said. Miss Adams also told the Subcommittee that she "stayed overnight in Hyde Park a couple of times—more than once—several times."

What was her purpose? A friend of hers told the Subcommittee:

"My memory of what she told me is that she was not carrying messages but that it was a continuing political conversation to show Roosevelt that the Communists had the same aims as the United States, and to persuade him—with great receptivity on his part—that the Soviet Union, the Communists, the Communist Party of the United States and the United States government were all going in the same direction . . . toward socialism."

What were some of the results of this pro-Soviet and

therefore inherently anti-Christian Liberalism infecting the government from the President on down? Let me borrow a summary from Towner Phelan writing in the *National Review*:

"The decision not to invade the Balkans as Churchill advocated; the decision to abandon Poland; the decision to let the Russians take Berlin despite Montgomery's urging that we get there first; the decision to halt Patton so that the Red Army could 'liberate' Czechoslovakia; the decision to pull our troops back from the parts of Saxony they had occupied in the closing days of the war in Europe; the decision to switch our support from Mikhaïlovitch to Tito and force a coalition between Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists; these were among the fateful decisions that made the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists the only victors in World War II."

(A footnote on all this: When you sift through the evidence, you find the name of Gen. George C. Marshall coming up again and again in the disastrous decisions enumerated above. Certainly he guessed wrong in insisting, against Churchill, on a Balkan invasion. And he guessed wrong on China.)

The pendulum of public opinion did not begin to swing against the Soviet Union until Churchill made his "Iron Curtain" speech in 1946 at Westminster College.

Fed up by then with Russian outrages and anti-U.S. propaganda, American opinion solidified behind Churchill. But not all. In May, 1946, Rep. Helen Gahagan Douglas, Sen. Kilgore, Sen. Taylor, and Vito Marcantonio were among those sponsoring a resolution that condemned our country and Great Britain for "the antagonism of the Western Allies to the new democratic and anti-fascist governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, and Yugoslavia." Elliott Roosevelt wanted the Dardanelles handed over to the Communists, and Sen. Claude ("Red") Pepper could still stand up in the Senate and defend Russia's 1946 aggression in Iran.

But what of the rest of the Liberals?—the tens of thousands sucked into all the Red fronts during the 30s and during World War II?

They could not too well support Russia openly. That policy had now become unfashionable. The more articulate and zealous of them could only work obliquely by supporting causes favorable to Communism.

But they still have a bad conscience, all these totalitarian Liberals. They can't live with themselves. Their instincts now tell them that for years they were wrong on the crucial issue of our generation and it kills them, for they are a proud lot, given to boasting of their superiority. Hence, they are obsessed both with a fear of discovery and with an itch to justify themselves by somehow rationalizing their mistake.

That is why the American community was stunned at the line drawn by the Hiss trial. To our amazement we saw the "brains" of the country spring to the defense of a quisling. In explanation, Diana Trilling of the *Nation* writes:

"Most anti-Communist Liberals have been through the Communist mill, or frighteningly close to it . . . They know not only how thin a line divided their own principles from Hiss' overt principles, but also how narrow a bridge Hiss had to span between his overt and his hidden beliefs . . . And they defend him so absolutely, with such emotions of outrage at whoever thinks him guilty, because they dare not contemplate where they themselves might be blown by the uncharted winds of fashionable doctrine. Hiss must be innocent to prove



that they are themselves innocent."

That is why every effort by Sen. McCarthy to expose treachery was greeted with a chorus of hoots and howls, with that fatuous explanation: "I approve what he is doing but not how he does it."

At the time I remember being mystified at Eleanor Roosevelt's remark that "Sen. McCarthy has cast a pall of fear over the nation." So I wrote an article for this paper entitled "Who's Afraid of Sen. McCarthy?" In my innocence it did not then occur to me that probably many of the people in her circle, together with thousands of others, former members of the League Against War and Fascism, of the Young Communist League, signers of the Stockholm Peace Petition, all kinds of people must have been terrified lest the Senator publish the membership rolls of their own particular front, thereby showing them up and making a gazing-stock of them before the whole community. They were scared to death, and since some of them worked in the Associated Press and the United Press, on Time, Life, Look, and Newsweek, they could gang together and fix the

Senator's wagon for him, the fiasco ending in Sen. Flanders' motion of censure.

(Remember their overnight canonization of Sen. Flanders? While directing the anti-McCarthy battle, he was "our leading statesman." After he had served their purpose, they dropped him back into obscurity.)

That is why there was such a fuss over the Rosenberg case—a plain matter of electrocuting a couple of traitors.

That is why a Congressional stigma of questionable loyalty is practically an invitation to lecture at Harvard or Johns Hopkins.

That is why, during the last campaign, the Vice-President suddenly became "Tricky Dick"—for no reason at all other than that he had helped put Hiss behind bars, thereby showing a most disagreeable intolerance for treason or even color of treason.

"All I know is what I read in the papers," Will Rogers used to say. And we might add that you can't even be sure of that, so keep a box of salt tablets handy as you read your paper, and use them generously.

## *A study in contradictions*

OUR country is at war with the Russian Empire. That is a commonplace.

It was a cold war that started in 1917, got warmer in 1946, and is now closer to the shooting stage. The Communists have always hated the rest of the world, but particularly America. This has been widely admitted in our country since Churchill's speech at Fulton, Missouri in 1946. By now it is so universally accepted that when Russia raised her sputnik it took a series of personal appearances on TV by President Eisenhower to quiet the mounting panic of the populace.

Now we are proceeding to arm 300 land and naval bases with nuclear weapons pointed at the Soviet Union, and we are told by General Thomas S. Power that our Strategic Air Command is on 24-hour alert with bomber planes constantly in the air ("not loaded with bows and arrows," he says,) listening for the radio command

that will send them streaking toward Russia.

In view of the fact that all of us face the possibility of being atomized sooner or later by the Russians, why did Mr. Eisenhower send their Ambassador a telegram congratulating the Russian people on the brutal skullduggery of 1917 that put them under the power of the Communist goon-squad? Indeed, since it has been demonstrated again and again that the Russian Embassy is general headquarters for a spy network encompassing our destruction, why should there be a Russian Ambassador in Washington, with his consuls and consulates scattered all over the country?

Since these people are determined to conquer our country and open their slave-labor camps on our soil, and since they have publicly avowed this (Khrushchev: "Your grandchildren will be Socialists—we will bury you!"), why does a person of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's stature feel impelled to have a cozy interview with the

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
Dec. 1, 1957

Communist high-chief hangman in person—Khrushchev? How can she get away with it?

After the German anti-semitic program of Nov. 10, 1938, Mrs. Roosevelt's husband broke off diplomatic relations with Hitler, recalling our Ambassador from Berlin and dismissing theirs from the United States. But Mrs. Roosevelt evidently sees a difference in type between Hitler and Khrushchev.

About that same time, Charles A. Lindberg toured Germany and got a look at some of their super-secret planes and installations. To gain entree, naturally he had to be polite to Reichmarshal Goehring. But the American press immediately jumped him and all but wrecked his life for him. So apparently you can have tea with a Khrushchev, but not with a Goehring.

It is contradictions like these that puzzle us average Americans. But God pity the average American who starts asking questions. Look what happened to McCarthy!

As we look back through the years, we see Roosevelt facing Stalin at Yalta with Alger Hiss at his side to protect American interests.

At Quebec, there was Harry Dexter White to shape the President's decisions.

For guidance on the question

of China—whether it should be free or Communist, there was the Institute of Pacific Relations, directed by Owen Lattimore and swarming with Reds.

From 1930 to 1945 Communism was the fashion in our country, the philosophy of the phony liberals and the godless eggheads, and there is still a lot of hidden sympathy in high places with Communism. Hence the paradox of a nation terrified by Russia and ready to wipe her off the map if Khrushchev so much as sneezes, yet going to their tea parties and wiring them congratulations on their anniversaries.

One thing is certain: sputnik is going to serve as an excuse for ditching all thought of government economy. But we can have a tax-cut and our little sputnik, too, if only Congress will cut out foreign aid, increased social security, and grants to farmers for not farming. But no, we will retain all our familiar old boondoggles, with a few extras piled on top.

As a matter of fact, according to Human Events, on November 8, Asst. Budget Director Robert E. Merriam emphasizes that the missiles program had suffered neither from lack of money nor of manpower. And Dr. Werner van Braun, rocket development chief at the Army's Redstone Arsenal, who

has long urged increased efforts in this field, asserts that the problem is not a financial one and that "we don't need excessive amounts of money." Additionally, says Human Events, the missiles program still has over \$2 billion in unexpended funds. Senator Styles Bridges says that what is needed is a crash program and better organization, and Philip M. Talmadge, President of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, has said that "If there has been a failure to match Soviet developments, it lies in inefficient use of money and man-power already at hand."

Again, there has been much talk of American inferiority in education. We'll grant that Russia has finally managed to raise up a generation of moral zombies, a species of mad scientists such as one sees on celluloid at drive-in theaters and Saturday matinees, a type that has adjusted comfortably to untruth, slavery, and the total denial of all human values. But is this admirable? Are we to imitate them?

To read most of the newspaper and magazine editorials, it has become an act of disloyalty in a boy to prefer Greek Drama or Medieval History over Calculus.

In selling the pepped-up science program, the final aim is

destruction — but it is never mentioned. "Put your boy in engineering (so that he can help us develop a faster tank) —or let him take physics and math (so that we can perhaps double the strength of the cobalt bomb)!"

I respectfully submit that these are hardly the suitable goals of an education. Goals such as these can only turn out the Russian-type of scientist. Education must deepen and broaden the youth; it must provide a philosophy of life, a love of truth, beauty, and goodness, a sympathy with others, an understanding of humanity and human achievements. Anything less can hardly be called education.

Under cover of the sputnik and with the pretext of national security, we can expect an all-out campaign for Federal Aid to education. But, really, the sputnik has not changed a thing in this field and it still remains true that Washington can't do anything for education that the States cannot more efficiently accomplish by themselves.

## *Hear ye! Hear ye!*

The Manion Forum is one of our favorite radio programs. Dean Manion used to be head of the Notre Dame Law School.

He left that to go with the Eisenhower Administration, but he was forced out of Government because of his sympathy with the Bricker Amendment. Dean Manion is on the air every Sunday night. You will have to look up the time and station in your daily paper. But give it a trial. I'm sure you'll like it!

Another good program—Fulton Lewis, Jr.—is in trouble for lack of sponsors, due to the fact that he has never been afraid to tell the truth. For example, during the Army-McCarthy hearings, he lost a large number of local sponsors. It was not that the sponsors themselves thought Fulton was presenting a false picture. Quite the con-

trary! But the sponsors got calls from influential people saying something like this: "We're telling you to drop your sponsorship of Fulton Lewis, Jr.—and we won't take no for an answer!" Many sponsors surrendered.

Here's what to do: If a local business firm is now sponsoring the broadcasts, tell its owner of your appreciation. Ask your friends to do likewise, especially if the appreciation can be put in the form of business. If there is no local sponsorship, go to the Mutual station in your town and talk it over with the sales manager. We must act now while there is still time to save these broadcasts.

## *The smear: how it works*

BACK in the days of naked and unashamed Communism in this country—not too long ago at that—it was a hardy soul who dared to go into a union meeting and vote against a resolution of sympathy for "our great sister-democracy, the U.S.S.R." or any of her numerous causes.

In the garment district of lower Manhattan, at least, such a person would find himself surrounded next day during the lunch hour by an arm-locked circle of shrews, shrilling obscenity at him, spitting at him and blowing phlegm on him until he looked and felt like a discarded sputum cup.

This is the literal execution of "the smear," imported into the United States from Communist Russia.

But if they couldn't give the smear literally, it was done figuratively by the printed word. The word went out via the Communist Daily Worker,

to be picked up by the "transmission belts," the egghead magazines and reviews on the fringe of the totalitarian left, thence to all the organs of publicity—radio, TV, wire services, daily papers, etc.—which, perversely, like to style themselves "liberal."

No epithet is too vile, no innuendo too monstrous, when it concerns an aggressive anti-Communist: tax-dodger, cheat, liar, hypocrite, homosexual, degenerate, alcoholic, "bum" Catholic—you name it and they'll say it!

Let us examine, for instance, Communist execution of their slogan "MacArthur must go," first raised in the strategic year of 1945. Louis Budenz has told how, as editor of the Daily Worker, he was present at the Communist meeting when this campaign was hatched against our Supreme Commander in the Pacific.

At a secret meeting on the 9th floor of 35 E. 12th Street in New York, national headquarters of the Communist Party,

Jan. 5, 1958

*Our Sunday Visitor,*

Russian conspiratorial experts named Alexander Bittleman and Robert William Weiner laid the foundation for slanderous assaults on the hero of the Pacific War. This drive reached a climax on Sept. 22, 1945, when the Worker declared the General "unfit" for the crucially important task of shaping the future of Japan. He was unfit in the eyes of the Worker, of course, because they knew he would turn Japan into a bulwark against the Soviet Union, thus making sure that there would be no Soviet conquest of Asia. They knew that Douglas MacArthur was the most intense and intelligent opponent of Soviet designs in the Far East.

After the end of World War II, word went out from Washington to MacArthur that he must let the Communists into the Joint Allied Control Board, slated to rule defeated Japan. Despite those orders, MacArthur kept them out and went ahead with what is generally recognized as a brilliant administration of Japan. But the anti-MacArthur propaganda, hatched by the Communists, went on unabated during his entire administration. It sank to the usual Red depths of character assassination and slander.

The General's prestige as hero of the Pacific War and

able administrator of Japan prevented the Reds from 1945 to 1950 from achieving their purpose of discrediting and ousting him. But the Reds did not give up and, at long last, in 1951, they got what they wanted. President Truman fired General Douglas MacArthur, thus removing the Reds' most formidable opponent from the Far East.

But the chief targets of Communist smear campaigns over the last 20 years have been the chairmen and members of the Congressional Committees investigating Communism. Recognizing such committees as the most effective opponents of the Communist Party within the United States, the Communists and their collaborators have kept up a continuous campaign of smears, insults, ridicule, and personal threats against the members of these committees.

The first Congressional committee to expose the Communist conspiracy was the House Committee on Communism of the 1930s, chaired by Congressman Hamilton Fish of New York. As a reward, Fish was driven from public life when his own party gerrymandered his district away from him. As recently as Christmas of 1956, the State Department issued a smear release without any evidence whatsoever, pur-

porting to link Fish with the Nazis.

In 1938, Martin Dies was an up and coming young Congressman, a magnificent speaker, with one of the brightest futures of any man in the Democratic Party. But as soon as he became the first chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he became the target of vitriolic abuse and personal threats from the left wing and card-carrying liberals.

When Dies persisted in his patriotic efforts to expose Communists in the CIO, in the movies, and in the State Department, his own party used the power of Federal spending to purge him from Congress. Every conceivable trick of smear, ridicule, intimidation, and political pressure was used to kill the Dies Committee from public life.

Out of the long list of Congressmen who have served during the 20 years of its existence, Nixon and Mundt are the only two members of the Un-American Activities Committee who have been able to remain in public office.

Congressman John McDowell of Pennsylvania, who, with Nixon, helped expose the perjury of Alger Hiss, was hounded from public life in

1948. When he committed suicide last month in Pittsburgh, the daily papers were quite frank in stating that the Communists—"at that time a power in Pennsylvania politics"—were implacable in their hatred of him and made it their prime objective to get him out of Washington. They did. And thus was John McDowell repaid for his service to the United States.

The list of other Congressmen purged includes the Hon. Messrs. Vail, Herbert, Busbey, Wood, Rankin, and Clardy, to name only a few. The one who got the worst treatment of all, naturally, was the chairman of the Committee when it exposed Alger Hiss, J. Parnell Thomas, who was indicted on a kickback charge—which is seldom if ever prosecuted. Ironically, the Communists had him in jail months before the Government got around to jailing Hiss!

If the left-wingers could have given the late Senator McCarthy the Parnell Thomas treatment, they surely would have done it. Although Joe McCarthy became the most investigated man in America, his enemies were unable to find any blemish in his record—even as petty as the one on which they sent Congressman Thomas to jail. Egged on by Drew Pearson, the Internal Revenue Service

spent years investigating McCarthy's tax returns. The result: It was found that McCarthy had overpaid his taxes and the Government had to give him a refund of \$1,200. But how many people do you know, gentle reader, who could emerge triumphant from a searching and even, one might say, a punitive and vindictive tax investigation?

What puzzles me is how the Communists are able to recruit legmen from among otherwise decent citizens. When they wanted to "get" McCarthy, himself a Republican, they got Republicans to do their dirty work for them. When they wanted to get Senator McCarran, a Democrat who was equally objectionable to the Communists for his countless patriotic activities—they hate the McCarran-Walter Immigration Law, they squirmed under his monumental investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations, his brilliant critique of the United Nations—they got Democrats to do their hatchet-work. Surviving their hatred, McCarran was one of the few

Communist enemies to die in public office.

As a priest, I have a sort of clinical interest in this rapid and thoughtless transmission of slander. I notice now, for instance, that the closer Nixon gets to the White House, the more protests of perpetual affection and eternal devotion he gets from those who, as recently as 18 months ago, were calling him "Tricky Dick." I commented on this smear at that time. It came from people who do not ordinarily read journals of political comment: let's face it—who don't even read the daily papers.

They couldn't tell me why he was "Tricky Dick." They had picked it up somewhere. But he was "Tricky Dick" for the same reason that Martin Dies and John McDowell were ordered back from Washington: he had made the political mistake of fighting Communism. He had helped put Hiss in jail. And our good American taxi-drivers, barbers, and waitresses were—unknowingly, of course—joining in a smear directed by the Kremlin.

## *How America fell behind*

BY now every American knows the high degree with which Soviet Russia developed the science of espionage. We marvelled when we read how the Russians had an agent, Julius Rosenberg, who just happened to be a key man at work on the nose of the A-bomb—and another agent Klaus Fuchs, who received top-secret clearance at Los Alamos. Was that coincidence, or was it master planning?

In the diplomatic field, the Communists displayed a genius even more remarkable than their talent for stealing our scientific secrets. In this field, they were able not only to filch our secrets, but also to influence and even to determine United States policy! A large degree of Communist success must be attributed to their ability to dictate *our* moves in the chess-game of power politics. Here are a few examples of the really big names whom

the Communists selected as their targets of influence:

In the early 1940s, they organized a plan to directly influence the President of the United States. For this task, they naturally did not pick a wild-eyed soap-box revolutionary. No indeed. They selected Miss Josephine Truslow Adams, lineal descendant of two presidents, John Adams and John Quincy Adams. From 1942 until Roosevelt's death in 1945, Miss Adams served as liaison between the President of the United States and Communist Party leader Earl Browder, carrying messages, documents, and information between the White House and Party Headquarters.

Miss Adams testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that she made 38 to 40 visits to Roosevelt at both the White House and Hyde Park. She told in detail how she sold the Communist line on Poland to the President. "When the decisions at Teheran came out," she said, "they



were in line with many discussions that I had with the President . . . It was after the Teheran meeting that Browder said to me, 'Well, my work is done!'

But Mr. Roosevelt was only the first President influenced by the Communists. Lauchlin Currie was identified under oath as a Soviet agent in the White House itself; he lived there and he was in charge of arranging presidential appointments, much like Sherman Adams under Eisenhower. Currie's assistant in the White House, Michael Greenberg, was a Communist. After he was exposed by a Congressional Committee, Lauchlin Currie fled to South America where he could not be reached by subpoena.

When F.D.R. died, however, Currie was still in that job, and he arranged for John Carter Vincent to see Harry Truman the very day after his inauguration. When Truman was preparing to meet Stalin at Potsdam, Currie arranged that he be briefed by Owen Lattimore just before he left, and that Lattimore's book, "Solution in Asia," be given to the President precisely during those critical days before Potsdam.

Always aware that there might be a change of administration in Washington, the Communists successfully plant-

ed an agent on Wendell Willkie while he was titular head of the Republican Party. You will remember that Willkie made a trip to Soviet Russia, came home, and published a best-selling eulogy of the Communist slave-empire called "One World." But Willkie never wrote that book! It was ghost-written by Joe Barnes, who has since been identified by five distinguished witnesses before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as a Communist or Communist agent.

Always adept at planting concealed Reds on prominent figures in public life, the Communists hung their man Cedric Belfrage on General Eisenhower while he was Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during World War II. Belfrage was one of Ike's press officers. He was finally deported as an undesirable alien on account of his activities for a Soviet espionage ring.

When, after the war, Eisenhower wrote his memoirs and called them "Crusade in Europe," he had to call in professional help, among whom, it has been said, was that same Joe Barnes, identified by five witnesses as a Communist agent, the man who had ghost-written Wendell Willkie's book. It is fantastic that the Communists should have been able to

place citizen-traitors in key spots to advise three presidents of the United States!

They were even more successful at planting their agents on other prominent and influential men in our Government. In 1944, they placed Owen Lattimore with Vice President Henry Wallace and the two of them made a trip together to Asia. As a result of that tour, Wallace put out two books under his own name, neither of them written by himself. "Our Job in the Pacific" was ghost-written by Owen Lattimore's wife—and the Daily Worker gave it the distinction of comparing it favorably with the then current work of Communist leader Earl Browder. The Vice President's other book, "Soviet Asia Mission," was ghost-written by A. J. Steiger, a writer on Marxist subjects, identified under oath as a Communist.

During the years of World War II, one of the most powerful men in America was Roosevelt's bosom companion, Harry Hopkins, who ate, slept, and lived 24-hours-a-day at the White House. Knowing of Hopkins' great power, the Communists assigned their agent, Louis Budenz, the job of influencing him. It was Budenz's assignment to convince Hopkins that Stalin was nothing but an over-

grown Boy Scout at heart, trustworthy, loyal, honest, generous, etc.—much more honest, even, than that scheming rascal Churchill. Budenz apparently scored 100 per cent, for Hopkins was ever the warm friend of Stalin, with all his works and pomps. It was Hopkins who was sent to Moscow soon after Yalta, and it was his action in acceding to Soviet demands that sealed the final doom of Poland.

The Communists always recognized the importance of influencing top officials of our State Department. In October, 1942, they got Lauchlin Currie to arrange a conference between Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and two top officials of the Communist Party. By personal and specific invitation, Welles met with Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Robert Minor, Assistant Secretary of the Communist Party. At this momentous meeting, Browder acted as practically the ambassador of the Chinese Communists, whose cause he pleaded. Browder and Minor sold Welles on the idea that the United States should no longer back Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese Reds, but that, instead, we should fall for the "united front" stratagem of the Communists in the name of unity—

a tactic which, in country after country, from Czechoslovakia to China—has meant victory for the Reds.

This Welles-Browder conference of 1942, emblazoned across the pages of the *Daily Worker*, gave immense prestige to the Chinese Communists and was the first round in the fight which led to the final victory of Red China.

After their success with Sumner Welles, the Communists kept pressing forward with still greater successes in our State Department. Their principal agent now was Alger Hiss. This remarkable person was able to exert influence on three different secretaries of state: Edward Stettinius, Dean Acheson, and John Foster Dulles, each with a different background, each appointed by a different president, but all taken in by the same conspirator—Alger Hiss.

Secretary of State Edward Stettinius wrote in his memoirs that, at the fateful Yalta Conference, it was his custom first thing in the morning to confer with Alger Hiss, and then again after dinner in the evening. J. Anthony Panuch testified under oath that Hiss "exercised a Svengali-like influence over the mental processes of Junior Stettinius."

Dean Acheson was long a

part of the Hiss clique in the State Department and is perhaps best known for his remark that, regardless of the decision of the appellate courts in affirming Hiss' conviction for perjury, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss."

As for Dulles—it was he who gave Hiss his \$20,000-a-year job as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The Communists were also successful in planting one of their cleverest agents, Harry Dexter White, on Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau. Through him, White was responsible for many of the important pro-Red policies of our Government, including the infamous Morgenthau Plan for Germany, the Quebec Agreement, the policy which destroyed China's financial solvency at a critical time, and the U.S. economic policy of forcing American war industry to become dependent on strategic minerals in Europe, Asia, and Africa, rather than developing our own resources.

The Reds were equally clever at placing their agents in our channels of communication. Whittaker Chambers told of the Communist cell at *Time* magazine; Mrs. Alger Hiss was secretary to Henry Luce, publisher of *Time*, *Life*, and *For-*

*tune*. The Senate Internal Security subcommittee revealed a Communist cell on the *New York Times*. The Reds had an agent, Mary Price, as secretary to the influential columnist Walter Lippman, and they had

another agent working as a leg-man for Drew Pearson.

But the most disturbing fact about all this is that these are only the ones that slipped up and were exposed. What about the rest?



## Billion-dollar boondoggle

UNDER a London dateline, the daily papers recently carried a story by Ernie Hill stating that millions of dollars of military equipment given by us to the British in the last ten years is being dumped back in our laps at the rate of \$100,000 a day.

It is creating quite a problem, Hill says, because a tangle of legal technicalities make it impossible for either them or us to sell the stuff.

Some of it is obsolete. The British just have too much of other things and want to unload. They are cutting down the size of their military forces and can't possibly use it. The military aid bounty includes everything from knives and forks to tanks.

One Air Force officer said that some of the tanks were delivered eight years ago and have never been taken out of their grease. He estimated that

about \$5-million worth of equipment is stacking up in five American depots and is creating a storage crisis.

When we gave it to the British we made them sign an agreement that they would not resell it. And we are not allowed to sell more than \$50,000 worth per month without paying British import duty on it.

Scrap metal dealers can't touch it because they would be required to pay duty which is more than they would pay to haul it away. Some of the trucks and tractors turned back may be used by American forces, but most of the equipment is of no use to anybody.

It is estimated that the British may hand back some \$50-million worth before they are through. Washington has been queried on what to do with the stuff as it is piling up. There seems to be no answer. It wouldn't be worthwhile to ship it back to the United States. One suggestion had been that we dig several big holes and

get rid of the equipment by burying it.

And in his message to Congress last month, the President asked for an appropriation of several billion dollars to finance more of the same. Indeed, he has let it be known that he will fight to the finish for this particular point of his program. He is organizing a broad and costly public relations program to "educate" us more simple minded Americans, presumably on the need for shipping more trucks and tractors, knives and forks to Britain.

When we read that the Government's Foreign Giveaway Program now totals roughly \$67-billion, the mind staggers in stupidity and passes on without comprehending. How much is \$67-billion?

Well, some years ago when the total was something less, the distinguished diplomat Spruille Braden was asked the same question and here is his answer. You will have to make the appropriate adjustment to bring it up to date—i.e., add 22% to his reckoning.

"I grasp the value of \$55-billion," he said, "when I add the assessed valuation, as reported by Moody's Municipal and Government Manual of 1956, of all the property, real and otherwise, in the 13 biggest

cities of this country: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Washington, San Francisco, Boston, Houston and Pittsburgh and arrive at a grand total of just over \$55-billion.

"We would be appalled by the mere suggestion that these 13 cities, if it were possible, be shipped overseas to foreign nations. Yet we have done the equivalent of that. We have given away—in effect destroyed as if by nuclear bombing—the equivalent of our 13 biggest cities."

The testimony on how this money is being spent is well nigh fantastic. Give ear to Director John B. Hollister of the International Cooperation Administration, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"There is a project which I think has considerable value, and that is the possibility of developing the communications, roads, and even conceivably something of a railroad connecting India with Nepal.

"Another possibility that I think would be most valuable to settle tensions, with which we are all familiar, is the possibility of a similar development of transportation between Pakistan and Afghanistan. This could make it a lot easier to

ship Afghanistan goods out through Pakistan to Karachi."

This from an Administration that won't give harried postal clerks another dime per hour, nor replace a worn out mailbag, without first trying to gouge it from the American taxpayer!

"I remember a plant which used silica," Senator Ellender (La.) told the Senate, with reference to a project built with giveaway dollars in Formosa. "Many thousands of dollars were spent to erect the plant," he said. "It was operated for about 30 days and then it had to close because it ran out of silica."

Was there an investigation of who bungled this expensive operation and wasted so many thousands of taxpayers' dollars? Not at all! If you will look on page one of your evening paper you will find that the Government was too busy investigating and prosecuting some harried dentist from the next town for a \$100-shortage in his tax payments. While the man who bungled on Formosa was doubtless rewarded by being made United States Ambassador to Ruritania.

Continuing his remarks on Formosa, Senator Ellender said, "When I was there I found to my surprise and disappointment that efforts were being made to have Uncle Sam foot

the bill for a Nationalist Chinese GI Bill of Rights.

"The entire cost of this program was to be furnished by the United States Government. The amount necessary to undertake the initial program was estimated to be \$38-million.

"I was told, without question, that our local mission would never consent to such a project, but I have learned lately that we are to undertake it, after all."

President Truman's widely touted Point Four Program, started in 1950, has developed into another give-away. Intended to furnish technical assistance to backward countries, here is what has happened, according to Eugene W. Castle, who has made a career of studying The Great Giveaway:

"Under Point Four, 36,000 American technicians and their families have been shipped to some 60 foreign countries to scatter our know-how and our dollars. More than 31,000 foreign technicians have been imported to be trained in American methods and then returned home to spread the training among their fellows.

"Both ways, coming and going, the American taxpayer paid the fare, freight and maintenance.

"A never-ending tidal flow

of supposedly superior humanity takes place. In the autumn of 1956, according to ICA Press Release 229 of October 8, 'more than 4,000 United States technicians were served overseas. Of these, 2,700 were United States Government employees and the remainder contract personnel.' Approximately 2,500 foreign technicians were receiving training in this country 'under the cooperative programs.' "

Where will it all end? In 1871, Germany had a surplus of several billion marks extracted from France in war indemnities. Then Bismark chose to fight Socialism by sinking Germany into Socialism — his own brand. By 1913, there was a national deficit of five billion and the Finance Minister warned the Kaiser that "the stability of the Empire is in danger." The First World War came as a reprieve, but in the end Ger-

many was bankrupt and finally Hitler took over.

In 1938, our own country was on the verge of a second great depression. Then Hitler attacked Poland and we went into the arms business—eventually, into the war.

We ended with a debt of \$250-billion, which grows greater every month; and through the manufacturing of armaments, the Foreign Giveaway, Point Four, and all the rest of it, we have continued in a war economy with its attendant expense and false prosperity.

Khrushchev of course is delighted, for he remembers the prophecy of Lenin: "We will make the United States spend herself into bankruptcy."

The debt will grow until the crash comes—when the United States will have lost its credit and our money will be worthless.

## *Positive approach to foreign aid*

THE Catholic Press last week reported a project for private medical aid to backward countries, launched by a doctor who believes in fighting Communism with medicine. It was suggested by Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, a Catholic ex-Navy physician who saw the horrors of Communism in northern Vietnam.

Under this privately operated venture, called "Medico," teams of physicians and medically trained assistants are to be sent into countries asking for them, to build clinics and small hospitals and to train local staffs.

To pay for this work, the International Rescue Committee, sponsoring the project, could doubtless get many millions of dollars from the government, extracted from the taxpayers under threat of fine or im-

prisonment, but instead they have announced the novel idea of trying to raise a million dollars by freewill offerings of the American people.

From the religious angle, if they got the taxpayers' money as a grant from Washington, the taxpayers would get no merit before God. Theirs would not be reckoned a charitable contribution. Whereas donations freely given for the purpose of healing God's poor throughout the world, increase the level of charity in the soul and carry with them untold merits.

During 1957, Catholic Relief Services sent more than one billion pounds of clothing, food, and medicine to the poor and displaced in foreign lands. This material had a total value of \$148 million. Contributing to the work were the 16,345 parishes of the United States.

Millions of Catholic men and women now made real "decis-

ions for Christ" in deciding to part with a second-best suit, a winter coat—not worn out, you understand, good enough for an occasional change at work, for casual wear at home, but—"Our Lord wants it. We'll have it cleaned and give it to the needy."

The important aspect of such relief work, says The Catholic Standard of Washington, "is that all this has been done just from the motive of charity and on a voluntary basis. Such work is immediate, unfettered, of universal appeal because free of any suspicion of ulterior motive. In addition, there is the boundless satisfaction of those participating, realizing that in helping the least of Christ's brethren, they are helping Him."

We Catholics are not alone in our charity toward God's poor. Other private agencies are also working earnestly, quietly, efficiently and with absolutely no expense to the taxpayer. The Catholic contribution is just about twice as great as that of any other single agency. Closest runner-up is CARE, which mails out food packages all over the earth. The turnover last year was just about half of ours. Next comes the Church World Service, Inc., then the Lutherans, then the American-Korean Foundation, then the

American Friends Service Committee. There are about 2,500 other organizations at work on Voluntary Foreign Aid.

This type of charity is basic. It is literally saving lives by filling empty stomachs and building fires in frosty shanties. There are other forms of Christian charity, however—not nearly so immediate, but vitally effective in promoting international understanding. To be most effective, you see, it must be a matter of "people to people" rather than "politicians to people."

The people of other lands can sense the difference immediately. The bureaucrat moves among them in a detached sort of way during the six or eight hours of his day. Then he gets into his Chrysler and returns to his Little America out in the suburbs, a superior world staffed with native servants, rich, glossy, and swimming in Martinis and Manhattans. But "people to people" is otherwise. Let me demonstrate:

In 1948, Italy was on the point of capture by either of two Stalinist factions under Togliatti and Nenni respectively, when the late Generoso Pope, publisher of the New York newspaper *Il Progresso Italo-Americano*, opened a letter-writing campaign. He urged all Americans with friends or

relatives in Italy to write and refute the lies being spread by the Communists about America. Committees were set up and mass meetings were held to promote the crusade.

It snowballed terrifically. Postmaster Albert Goldman reported that on the eve of the election, airmail letters were leaving New York for Italy at the rate of a million weekly. Tens of thousands of cable letters also went out during the last week.

As we know, the Communists were overwhelmingly defeated and the friendly government of Alcide de Gasperi was swept into office.

Thus American individuals were able to accomplish what billions of government dollars could never have done. A nation was saved for civilization and it didn't cost the American taxpayer one red cent!

Mrs. James Sparkman heads an organization in New York called "Operation Town Affiliation," by which an American town or city can affiliate with a similar town abroad. Thus, for example, the mayor of Toledo, Ohio invites Toledo in Spain to become a sister-city. If the invitation is accepted, the people begin corresponding, pastors with pastors, students with students, Scouts

with Scouts, etc. They get to know each other and form international ties, people with people. Mrs. Sparkman has promoted hundreds of such affiliations in 40 different countries.

This worried Washington, however, so although Town Affiliation was getting along beautifully, the Spenders decided to set up their own system of affiliations: so now there is a parallel program operated by the Office of Private Enterprise Cooperation, which is a branch of the United States Information Agency. Money is being withheld from your pay envelope to pay for this unnecessary duplication.

Harry Holt, an Oregon farmer, has personally adopted eight illegitimate babies sired by American soldiers in Korea, and has brought them back here to grow up on his farm in Oregon. In collaboration with World Vision, a private agency, he is now supporting 36 other Korean orphans and has financed the building of two 50-bed orphanages in Korea.

This is all private expenditure. Nevertheless, since it makes no room for theorists, researchers, pollsters, and psychologists, the bureaucrats figured it must be small-time and must be stepped up with Government advice and funds. Ac-

cordingly, under the aegis of President Eisenhower, a people-to-people conference was convened in Washington on Sept. 11, 1956. The president greeted the delegates and committees were set up to foster person-to-person projects in 40 different sectors of the national life—all in the name of the government. That is all that came of it, fortunately.

Person-to-person operations are the spontaneous free will ventures of private citizens. Government intervention would only destroy their effect.

Speaking of government giveaways, Cardinal Cushing of Boston once said: "A system dealing with human welfare that outlaws charity becomes in time a pagan system under which you cannot have the brotherhood of man, because it does not admit the fatherhood of God." Such a sys-

tem may be philanthropy, he said, but it is not charity.

"The public is becoming more convinced," the Cardinal continued, "that our rich uncle can and should with a fistful of dollars beat off poverty and all other afflictions that beset our less fortunate brothers.

"This is a happiness pill with disastrous effects. Whenever there arises a social problem, we would be well advised not to expect that its solution lies in increasing still more the power, influence, and taxes of the Federal Government. In a word," he continued, "the Government should stop doing for people the things that people can do for themselves. A gigantic Government giveaway scheme must be paid for dearly, now and in the future, by staggering assessments, loss of personal responsibility, and diminished independence."

## A study in pressures

**I**F the Foreign Giveaway is such a sterile and disastrous program for the United States, why is it voted through each year? Why does Congress decree the necessary funds?

The answer is simple. The program has spawned a highly-paid class of executives, urbane, cultured, immaculately groomed and supremely intelligent, most of whose time and all of whose keen wit—with millions of dollars available in the till—is devoted to scheming ways of perpetuating the "soft touch" they now enjoy. In 1956, the Government's civilian payroll came to \$10.5 billion—not all of them in on the Foreign Giveaway Program, of course, but all of them with a vested interest in White House policies.

Next, you must remember that when half a billion is voted to Tito, for instance, it does not take the form of bales of currency sent in battle-ships to Yugoslavia. Tito never

sees a dollar bill. It goes as tanks, rifles, jeeps, swivel chairs, and all the other vital mechanism of presentday warfare, manufactured in Pittsburgh, Seattle, Detroit, Chicago, etc. Thus, for once at least, big business is allied with union leadership in keeping us little fellows strapped over the barrel.

A partial list of multimillion-dollar firms allowed tax write-offs for such Government orders—classed as defense—includes:

General Motors, \$6.8 billion; General Electric, \$4.3 billion; General Dynamics, \$3.5 billion; A. T. & T., \$2.26 billion; Chrysler, \$2.1 billion; Ford, \$2.08 billion; Sperry-Rand, \$1.4 billion; Westinghouse, \$1.19 billion; Studebaker-Packard, \$955 million; RCA, \$878 million; International Harvester, \$656 million; Goodyear, \$646 million; Eastman Kodak, \$512 million; Standard Oil (N. J.), \$506 million; Philco, \$501 million; Firestone, \$478 million.

So when you read that a man

like Thomas J. Watson, Jr., President of the International Business Machines Corporation and Chairman of the U. S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, declares that "international cooperation" (Foreign Giveaway) must continue unabated; when he charges that plugging this rathole would force other nations to retaliatory practices from which this country would suffer; and when he declares that such a turn by the United States would cause us "to revert to an isolationist approach to the world," you wonder whether he is not really drumming up more business for his own IBM rather than plugging the interests of U.S.A.

Others with a vested interest in extending the Giveaway are influential politicians of the past and present. Dan Smoot enumerates the following examples:

Dean Acheson, former Democratic Secretary of State, whose law firm reported receipts from foreign governments in 1955 of \$304,770—from Pakistan, Denmark, Canada and Colombia.

Thomas E. Dewey, twice Republican candidate for the Presidency, who gets a large retainer from the Government of Turkey to help promote a loan from the U.S.A. Turkey

gave Dewey \$75,000 for his services in 1955 alone.

Oscar Chapman, former Democratic Secretary of the Interior, received \$27,498 from Mexico.

Leon Keyserling, Truman economist, received \$4,500 from France.

Edward W. Barrett, Acheson's former assistant Secretary of State, received \$70,000 from the Suez Canal Co. and from the Japanese Government.

William J. Donovan, former head of the Office of Strategic Services, received \$51,597 from Thailand.

Charles Patrick Clark, former counsel for Truman's Senate committee and now associated with Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in the practice of law, received \$89,999 from Spain.

Associated with the Export-Import Bank and profiting from its activities in negotiating a \$320 million loan to Japan were:

Banks of America National Trust & Savings Institution; Bank of the Southwest National Association; Bankers Trust Co.; Brown Brothers Harriman & Co.; the Chase Manhattan Bank; Chemical Corn Exchange Bank; Crocker-Anglo National Bank; First National Bank of Boston; First National Bank of Chicago; First National Bank in Dallas; Guaranty Trust Co.



of New York; First National City Bank of New York; the Hanover Bank; Irving Trust Co.; Manufacturers Trust Co.; Marine Midland Trust Co. of New York; National Bank of Commerce of Houston; National Bank of Commerce of Seattle; Republic National Bank of Dallas; J. Henry Schroeder Banking Corporation; Seattle First National Bank; Wells Fargo Bank.

Mind you, I don't blame the directors of these banks for picking up this fat piece of Government business as long as it has been offered. But it does go far to explain how such a benign climate exists toward the Foreign Giveaway in high circles of influence and in direct opposition to grassroots sentiment back home.

However, as Eugene Castle puts it in "The Great Giveaway,"

"The Export-Import Bank is but one agency, and a minor one, engaging in our Government's foreign benevolence. Multiply its activity X times, extend the result year after year, and an idea may be gained of the taxpayers' losses and the reasons why the Government wants to continue the free flow of big tax money to the Treasury."

Added to the pressure from the capitalists and interested

politicians is that of the labor leaders. Speaking to the students of the University of Texas last month, Mr. Walter Reuther announced the report of the Economics Policy Committee of the AFL-CIO, which he heads. In summary, the Committee's program of economic action demands more money for national defense, more money for foreign aid, more money for schools, more money for home buyers, more money for small businesses, more money for rural cooperatives, more money for state unemployment benefits, and more money for organized labor. The money would be extracted from the people as taxes under threat of fine or imprisonment.

And our statesmen: Whenever there is talk of hedging national bankruptcy by eliminating the Giveaway, there are the moans of gloom and doom from the Liberal Left. Khrushchev has only to stir a teapot-tempest in some remote part of the world and our fragile allies start screaming for dollars.

In the meantime, all of this spending is shrinking our dollar to the vanishing point. That is what they mean by "Inflation." Dean Manion gives this example:

An invalid woman who for 20 years has depended upon a fixed trust fund income of \$150

per month, pays \$17.50 a month Federal income taxes compared with only \$2.00 in 1939.

Therefore, her current monthly check has now shriveled to \$132.84 instead of \$148. Moreover, since today's dollar now has only 50 cents of its 1939 purchasing power, her current buying power is only \$66.42 per month, or almost \$82.00 per month less than the \$148 net which this invalid woman received in 1939. This sorry example can be multiplied by millions dependent upon fixed incomes throughout America, he says.

So—is the Giveaway Program a good thing? Yes, indeed, says the Young Catholic Messenger of last May 24. This little paper is studied by 600,000 children each week in Catholic grammar schools.

It seems that people all over the world want "schools, hospitals, roads, dams, guns, and

planes. If we do not help them get these things, Russia will." Frankly, I doubt it. But to continue with this little study-outline for young Catholics:

JACK: Nobody has said when, if ever, the aid program will end.

JEANNE: It's likely to go on for a long time. There's a foreign aid plan now before Congress. A fund will be set up to lend up to \$750 million a year . . .

Perhaps the most vital question was not mentioned. Allow me to supply it:

JACK: But where will the money come from?

BETTY: From Daddy's pay-envelope of course!

JEANNE: But does this not cause inflation and will it not shrink my Mommy's pension?

BETTY: Then they will raise Social Security and vote more taxes . . .

Nothing like getting them REAL young, is there!



## Know your enemy

IN response to the several articles on current issues which have appeared recently in this space, I have received hundreds of letters which say, in effect, "Bully for you! But I am only one individual. I have no influence. What can I do?"

You can do plenty, and you do have influence, whoever you are, within your own family, your own little circle, in your own community. Only don't be backward. Don't be timid. Learn to speak up. Learn the knack of polite contradiction. And don't ever be ashamed to sponsor a cause just because it happens to be unfashionable. It was the fashion, remember, to run down McCarthy. In those days, it took "guts" to say "I am for McCarthy. I agree with him that we should get the Reds out of our Government." But those who had the courage to say it then have a good conscience today.

The first step, then, in bat-

tlung Communism intelligently is to know your enemy and make him known for what he is. Hence,

1. *Read anti-Communist books and magazines* such as those on the "Reading List For Americans," which you can have by writing to OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, with a four-cent stamp enclosed. We have already distributed over 1,700 of these to our readers. Lend your copies of such books and magazines to others and ask for them back. Give anti-Communist books and magazines as gifts. Use back copies of your magazines either for your own file or to distribute to other interested friends and neighbors.

2. *See that anti-Communist publications* such as National Republic, Human Events, American Mercury, National Review, and U.S. News & World Report are available in the waiting rooms of your doctor, dentist, beauty parlor, barber, club, etc. Persuade such people to subscribe to anti-Communist periodicals rather than to the

left-slanted magazines usually found in such places. Distribute your old copies to them free.

3. *See that the anti-Communist books and magazines* are purchased by and available in your branch of the public library and also in your local bookstore. Get at least one anti-Communist book into your library each week. If the librarian is unwilling to purchase the books, find someone who will donate good books regularly—surely a worthy cause for your organization, whatever it may be.

4. *Listen to Dean Clarence Manion's* excellent radio broadcast, heard coast to coast every Sunday evening. Help this fine program expand its coverage to more stations by your support.

5. *Listen to anti-Communist radio commentators*, such as Fulton Lewis and John T. Flynn. Help these commentators remain on the air by writing sponsors to let them know you use their products because they sponsor pro-American programs. Develop a "Listening Post" to alert your friends and neighbors to the anti-Communist programs available in your area.

6. *Subscribe to at least one publication* which gives the Communist line. Only if you know what the current line is can you detect it when it comes

out of the mouths of prominent Americans. For instance, among the items in the Communist line at the present time are pressure for a summit conference and for the exchange of "cultural" delegations. One of the most reliable sources for this information is Louis Budenz's weekly column, carried by many of our diocesan papers, as well as his monthly newsletter, The Communist Line Bulletin.

7. *Promote anti-Red speakers* in your community and in the various organizations to which you belong. Have any of the following speakers been heard in your community?—William F. Buckley, Jr., Dean Clarence Manion, Felix Wittmer, Dr. Anthony Bouscaren, Dr. J. B. Matthews, Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, Louis F. Budenz, Dr. E. Merrill Root, Frank Barnett, Robert Morris, Richard Arens, Eugene Castle? Most of them are fascinating speakers, all of them are at least competent and well informed.

8. *Use book reviews* as programs for clubs and organizations in your community. Book reviews are always a favorite type of program, especially with women's groups. Yet the reviewing of anti-Communist books is virtually an untapped field. Many of the books on the Reading List offer possibilities

for unsurpassed entertainment. Inaugurate a book-of-the-month series. A five-minute book review at each meeting can add sparkle and variety to your program, train your members to speak with knowledge on controversial issues, and bring out the truth on important national subjects.

9. *Start an information table* at the Knights of Columbus, in your women's club, or other community organization. Display good reading material on a table at the entrance each meeting, and this will give the members facts with which to answer Communist and Socialist propaganda. Make yourself the club Librarian—the prosey name for a patriot willing to take on the chore of collecting good reading material, bringing it to the meeting, and displaying it on a table. Don't make it hard for yourself by trying to keep records of which member has what pamphlet. Try to get several copies of important pieces.

10. *Organize a study club* in your own community. This may be a small group organized for the sole purpose of studying Communism and national affairs, or it may operate as an adjunct of any regularly established club or organization.

A Study Group means education in American history and

principles by means of the do-it-yourself technique. It is suggested that such a group have from six to 20 members and that it meet twice a month. If each participant will agree to do a certain minimum amount of "homework" before each meeting, such as reading and mastering one magazine article or one chapter in a book, the benefits of the study program will be increased accordingly and the whole burden will be lifted from the leader.

Start a Clipping File on world events from current newspapers and magazines. So that no one person has to become an expert on everything, each one in the Study Group, women's club, or other gathering, should take a different subject. One could take Communist espionage, another Congressional investigations, another the Foreign Aid, another the United Nations, etc. Each individual clipping would not only be highly educational for the member assembling it, but it would also enable him to be a source for others in the Group on that particular subject, to become an active participant in panel discussions, etc.

11. *Distribute anti-Communist literature* everywhere you go, in your club, at meetings, in public places. Don't waste time trying to convert pro-Communis-

nists. Our task is to convert non-Communists into anti-Communists.

Don't miss any opportunity to get anti-Red books, magazines, and ideas into the hands of influential persons, particularly in the Government and in the writing fields. It was an unknown person who anonymously dropped into a mailbox a book addressed: "To Sun-Yat-Sen, Canton, China," who saved China from Communism for 20 years. This book converted Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen from Marxism to Capitalism and stopped the plan he had already initiated to impose Communism on the Chinese people. A generation later, it was another book which helped to turn China over to the Communists. As President Truman was preparing to leave for the Potsdam Conference in 1945, someone slipped a copy of Owen Lattimore's "Solution in China" into his hands. It was Lattimore who advocated: "The thing to do, therefore is to let China fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed her." And it was at Potsdam that the fate of China was sealed. Lattimore is now teaching at Johns

Hopkins University, Baltimore—which reminds me:

12. *Stop, look, and listen* before you select a school or college for your children. Avoid schools and colleges which tolerate pro-Communist and Fifth-Amendment teachers in the name of "academic freedom." Take an interest in who is teaching at your own college—if you are a student or an alumnus—and in state-supported schools and colleges. Find out what is being taught in the schools you support. Bring up this subject at alumni meetings and in correspondence.

All this is known as activity at the grassroots. You and I live at the grassroots. We are not judges, nor legislators, nor college presidents, nor millionaires. But our Senators and Congressmen are very sensitive to pressure from the grassroots as they note it in their mail and in their other contacts, for they know that they must give an account of their stewardship on election day. That is when the people at the grassroots rise up in all their faceless might and clean house.

## *A chapter in American history*

THE chapter of Winston Churchill's memoirs which appeared recently in *Look* is a whitewash, a contribution to the "official" history of the Forties. Sir Winston takes the liberty of deploring the blunders of the West in dealing with Communism, but at the same time he lauds the men who did the blundering.

Only once is there a trace of sharpness. Only one man is mentioned with just a hint of disapproval. Sir Winston tells of his famous iron-curtain speech of March, 1946 at Fulton, Missouri. He had talked it over beforehand with Mr. Truman and Secretary Byrnes of the State Department. He goes on to describe the reaction throughout the world, and then he speaks of a celebration in his honor in New York.

"All around the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel . . . were marching

---

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
May 4, 1958

pickets of Communists, and I was somewhat surprised to learn that Mr. Dean Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, was not coming.

Obviously, Dean G. Acheson did not approve of Churchill's candor as regards Russia. Acheson had been working for the Communists at least as early as 1933.

Since then he has been in and out of Government several times. When out of Government, he practices law with the Washington firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, O'Brien, and Shorb, who specialize in representing foreign governments. Here is how it works:

In 1946, when Red Poland applied to our Government for a loan of \$90-million, Acheson was Under Secretary and occasionally Acting Secretary of State. Naturally—and, as it turned out, wisely—the Communists engaged Acheson's law firm, with Alger's brother Don-

ald Hiss assigned directly to the case.

On hearing of the application, our Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, begged the State Department to refuse the loan, since it would only go to help fasten the iron claw more tightly on Poland. "With the greatest earnestness of which I am capable," Mr. Lane pleaded, "I beg the department not to approve the extensions of any credits at this time."

On April 24, 1946, Acting Secretary Acheson OK'ed the loan. His firm collected a fee of \$51,653.98, and the loan went to buy jackboots and clubs for the Polish Secret Police.

As late as June, 1947, Acheson insisted that we continue lend-lease direct to Russia. Against Congressional opposition, he forced delivery of \$17-million worth of supplies. This was at a time when we were already fighting Red aggression in Greece!

In that very same month, a Senate appropriations subcommittee addressed a secret memorandum to General Marshall, then Secretary of State:

"It becomes necessary due to the gravity of the situation to call your attention to a condition that developed and still flourishes in the State Department under the administration of Dean Acheson. It is evident

that there is a deliberate, calculated program being carried out not only to protect Communist personnel in high places but to reduce security and intelligence protection to a nullity. On file in the department is a copy of a preliminary report of the FBI on Soviet espionage activities in the United States which involves a large number of State Department employes, some in high official positions. This report has been challenged and ignored by those charged with the responsibility of administering the department with the apparent tacit approval of Mr. Acheson. Should this case break before the State Department acts, it will be a national disgrace. Voluminous files are on hand in the department proving the connections of the State Department employes and officials of this Soviet espionage ring."

General George Catlett Marshall received this confidential memorandum—and did nothing. In 1950, however, Senator Joseph McCarthy burst upon the scene and began looking after the interests of the Republic. And in November of 1952, the people of the United States handed Dean Gooderham Acheson his walking papers.

I have made a careful search

of the record and I have yet to find one instance in which Dean Acheson denounced the Communists or did anything to block their aims. One thinks perhaps of the Marshall Plan, which he supported. But as originally drawn up, the Marshall Plan included aid for Russia and the Eastern satellites, as well as for the West.

How about the Korean War? That was one of those inexplicable decisions made by President Truman on his own. Acheson had it handed to him. I have never seen any evidence that he approved the decision to go into Korea and fight. One might say there is no evidence that he opposed it. But Acheson is too smart for that. He would never be so blunt as his lieutenant, Owen Lattimore, who said that "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed her."

Acheson is a master diplomat. Some months prior to the outbreak of the Korean War, he publicly announced the "perimeter" of our defenses—Korea being beyond the perimeter. That was his diplomatic way of handing Korea to the Communists.

No, having found that we were at war, Acheson couldn't very well oppose the effort. Instead, he tried to sidetrack it

into the UN, where it would be talked to death. But MacArthur was winning too rapidly, and every action of the State Department was directed toward ensuring that we wouldn't win the war.

Every one of our generals who fought in Korea—including MacArthur, Stratemeyer, Van Fleet, and Clark—has testified that it was the State Department (i.e., Acheson) which prevented them from winning the war. They do not blame the Joint Chiefs. They don't blame anyone except Acheson. That's what it boils down to. This is so well documented that I won't repeat it here except to mention a few points:

Louis Johnson was Secretary of Defense. He backed MacArthur in his daring plans for the Inchon Landing. It was successful—too successful. There developed a personal feud between Johnson and Acheson. Johnson was sacked, and Marshall was brought in as Secretary of Defense for the purpose of firing MacArthur, because Marshall was the only general considered big enough to give orders to MacArthur.

Meanwhile, Acheson continued with his program of tying MacArthur's hands to prevent victory. Everyone knows about the "privileged sanctuary." But what is not so well known is

that our forces were not allowed to bomb the hydroelectric dams and reservoirs within North Korea—although these dams provided two-thirds of the power to Red China. Thus, we could have cut off Red China's power without ever crossing the Yalu! MacArthur said that when he gave orders to bomb the bridges over the Yalu, his orders were countermanded from Washington within hours.

One cannot help admiring President Truman's courage in standing up to the Russians on the Korean issue. But having declared his war, he should have won it. We have all made brave decisions in the middle of the night and then lost our nerve on reexamining them next morning. Was this such a decision on Truman's part?

MacArthur judged it a sound decision, and General Van Fleet has said that Korea was "the right war, at the right time, in the right place."

Certainly President Truman acted with far more bravery than Eisenhower in his moment of crisis. Speaking in St. Louis not long ago, a former Hungarian cabinet minister and staunch anti-Red, Dr. Nicholas Nyarydi, now teaching at Bradley University in Peoria, Illinois, said that if the United States had supplied only one per cent of the aid we poured into South Korea; if we had sent only one brass band to march through the streets of Budapest playing "The Stars and Stripes Forever," revolts would have started everywhere behind the iron curtain and defections from the Soviet Army would have been so widespread that the whole Red Empire might well have crumbled. He reminded his listeners that the only volunteers to help the Freedom Fighters were Russians—who defected from their own army. Even an Acheson could not have prevented us from winning in Hungary!

## *'What can I do?'*

ACCORDING to testimony released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, present developments in America are following the same pattern that preceded the Communist takeover in the other parts of the world.

Testimony was offered by Edward Hunter, an editor and reporter with 30 years' experience in Europe, Africa, Japan, China, Manchukuo, and two years of service with the U.S. Office of Strategic Services. He served as a propaganda specialist in the China-Burma-India theater during the last war.

"I have been watching developments under Communism in other parts of the world and now I see exactly the same developments here in America," he said.

These developments "include, first of all, the penetration of our leadership circles by a softening up, and creating a defeatist state of mind. This includes penetration of our ed-

ucation circles by a similar state of mind, in addition to one other thing — the long-range perspective of the professor who is above anything that is happening here and now, and considers himself an objective spectator in a long, long vista of history.

"I see, primarily, as a part of this softening up process in America, the liquidation of our attitudes on what we used to recognize as right and wrong, what we used to accept as absolute moral standards. We now confuse moral standards with the sophistication of dialectical materialism, with a Communist crackpot theology which teaches that everything changes, and that what is right or wrong, good or bad, changes as well. So nothing, they say, is really good or bad. There is no such thing as truth or a lie; and any belief we actually held was simply our being unsophisticated. They don't say this in so many words, except to those who are already indoctrinated in Communism. What they say to the rest of us is to be objec-

tive: and then they twist that word 'objective' into meaning what they mean by dialectical materialism.

"The United States is the main battlefield in this Red war," according to Mr. Hunter. "I mean specifically the people and the soil and the resources of the United States."

He said that "the first battles in this total war have already been won by the forces of international Communism in the United States," and "these victories are identical to those they have won in every country which they have ultimately taken over."

Mr. Hunter said the Reds "have succeeded in softening up a large element of the American population, particularly among those to whom we look for guidance, our so-called intellectuals and our so-called liberal circles.

"They have succeeded in making the United States think and talk of a co-existence period, as if that were an end in itself," he said, "while in other parts of the world, as in India, the Reds frankly explain that this co-existence is merely intended to give the Americans an easy way to choose their road to Communism.

"This is the strategy," Mr. Hunter continued. "The Krem-

lin is merely giving the United States a choice of surrendering by voluntary change of attitude, to avoid more destructive ways of surrender. Unfortunately, in the United States large elements, mainly among our non-Communist population, have been softened up into believing that if we can just stall on this situation, it will take care of itself."

Mr. Hunter called this the Communist "brainwashing program in the United States" and said it is being abetted by "the collapse of traditional American ideals of self-reliance and individual integrity."

"What can I do to help reverse this tide and save our country from a Communist takeover?" You can do plenty, as I've said before. You do have influence, whoever you are, within your own family, your own little circle, in your own community. Only don't be backward. Learn to speak up. Learn the knack of polite contradiction. And don't ever be ashamed to sponsor a cause just because it happens to be unfashionable. The first step, then, in battling Communism intelligently is to know your enemy and make him known for what he is. In the issue of March 16 I suggested a program by means of which you could inform yourself and



others. Now here are some points for action:

1. *Every American can write letters to our Senators and Congressmen.* You have two Senators and a Congressman representing you in Washington. But they cannot properly represent you unless you let them know what you want. Your letters are important and effective. How can you blame your Congressman for voting wrong when he receives letters only from pro-Reds and left-wingers, who are aggressive, persistent, and "on the ball"?

2. *Write letters to newspapers and magazines.* The Readers' Column is among the most avidly read sections of most publications. Here is a splendid opportunity to spread anti-Communist information and ideas, to broadcast the word of what is the current Communist line. Watch the newspapers and magazines carefully to see what kind of letters they print. Don't use your letters for useless or rabid criticism, but to spread accurate information. Write particularly to out-of-town newspapers, which like to show a wide circulation. Even if your letter does not achieve publication, it shows the editor the temper of those who are paying his bills for him. Incidentally, OUR SUNDAY VISITOR is not copyrighted.

Help yourself to anything you see in these columns. Give us credit where possible, but if expedient, omit the credit.

3. *Don't use the term "Communist" loosely.* You may do the cause more harm than good. Remember, it is not enough to be against Communism. We must combat Communism with knowledge and facts.

4. *Support Congressional committees investigating Communism,* particularly the House Un-American Activities Committee (quoted above) and the Senate Internal Security Committee. These committees are really our best weapon against subversion because they provide the documents and sworn testimony revealing Red espionage and penetration over the last 25 years. The abolition or crippling of these committees is a high-priority feature of the current Communist program.

5. *Support the anti-Communist legislation now on the books,* such as the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Subversive Activities Control Act. Our Internal defenses against Communism have been badly crippled by recent decisions of the Supreme Court, particularly by the Watkins, Jencks, Nelson, Sweezy, Slochower, Cole, and Service decisions. Under our American sys-

tem of government, the people have every right to demand laws to overcome the bad effects of bad Court decisions. Support legislation which has been introduced to reverse these decisions.

6. *Give your patronage to companies that advertise in anti-Communist magazines* such as National Review and the American Mercury, and which sponsor anti-Communist radio and TV programs—and write the firms that you are doing this. By the same token, withhold your patronage from firms which sponsor leftwing radio and TV commentators and which advertise in the liberal magazines — and write them why.

7. *Give financial support to competent magazines, writers, speakers, and organizations fighting Communism.* The Communist Party regularly demands that its members con-

tribute 10 per cent of their earnings to the Party. We should support the anti-Communists who have been carrying on the battle, usually at great personal, financial, and even social sacrifice.

8. *Ask your local newspaper to carry Dean Clarence Manion's broadcasts* as a regular weekly column. This can be arranged without charge through the Manion Forum, South Bend, Indiana. It would provide a splendid antidote to the many leftwing columnists carried by most newspapers. Dean Manion, remember, is one of the ablest Constitutional lawyers in the country. He was Dean of the Notre Dame Law School for years, until he was called to a high post in the Eisenhower Administration, which he left so that he could devote all his time to waging the battle for freedom of the individual in the United States.



## Thoughts while reading

THE book quoted is John Noble's "I Was A Slave In Russia," published this spring by the Devin-Adair Co., New York, at \$3.75. A young Detroit, Noble was taken prisoner by the Reds in 1945, was shuttled from prison to prison—Dresden, Muehlberg, and Buchenwald—ending up finally in Vorkuta, 50 miles above the Arctic Circle. While the Russians kept his name out of their files and refused to acknowledge his U.S. citizenship, he was kept at work in the mines pushing 2-ton coal cars even after his weight had dropped from 155 to 95 pounds. He tells the whole astounding story of his life in Vorkuta, including the famous slave uprising in 1953 after Beria's arrest. Following his release in January, 1955, he spent more than two weeks in Washington briefing State Department officials on all he saw and heard.

(Quotations from his book

Our Sunday Visitor,  
June 22, 1958

are in Roman type, comments in italics.)

"At seven the following morning my father and I were taken, as prisoners of the Soviet political police, to NKVD headquarters in Dresden . . . Then I heard the screams.

"Someone was being whipped. The screams were clear but directionless, as though filtered through the thick walls of the prison . . . Suddenly a closer sound of violence slammed into the cell block. It came from the fourth floor. As I looked, a cell door opened. Guards dragged a struggling prisoner out and threw him to the floor. He tried to fight his way up, and they pounced on him and pinned him to the floor with their knees. Then they stripped him, tearing his shirt away and pulling his trousers off in a violent tug that left the prisoner tumbled head down in a heap against the wall.

"One guard had a short leather whip. The other hastily pulled off his belt. Then they began beating the man, not

slowly and methodically but rapidly and in semi-frenzy. They kicked him and shoved him along the floor while they tore his skin with their cutting lengths of leather. His screams were terror-filled and anguished.

"I couldn't keep from watching; the horror of it was hypnotic. Long after the guards had finished, panting, and had flung the bloody, whimpering man back into the cell, the scene and the sounds stayed on in my mind, even into sleep.

"And added to them were new screams from the questioning room."

"Surrounded by Russian souvenirs, including a 6-ft. lilac bush, mop-topped Pianist Van Cliburn, 23, fresh from victory in Moscow's International Tchaikovsky Competition, flew into New York to clasp his happy parents with bear hugs, gab about his Russian hosts ('They're very much like Texans'), shake hands with fans (among them, one seven-year-old who rapturously referred to him as 'Moving Van'), and settle down for a concert tour. Next day Van was back at Idlewild airport to embrace a new buddy, Soviet Conductor Kiril Kondrashin, who will direct orchestras for Van in New York, Philadelphia and Washington." *Time*, May 26.

"Screams could be heard almost constantly from the questioning room. I learned, though, that the mind can erect barriers against such sounds, so that unless one tries one cannot hear them. Prisoners who couldn't shut them out didn't last long. They went mad. I was told that one of the many prisoners who attempted suicide tried to kill himself in his madness by crashing his head against the wall of his cell."

Here at home, Americans jumped to their feet and stood at attention for the rendition of the Soviet national anthem, "The Internationale," at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York, where the stars-and-stripes were hung side by side with the hammer-and-sickle for the performance of the Soviet Moiseyev dancers.

"Three days passed and no food was distributed to us. When it became apparent on the first of those days that there was to be no food, loud protests, uncontrolled curses and screaming were let loose. They became louder as the second, third, and fourth days went by. Men went out of their minds, women prisoners became hysterical. Some Moslem prisoners chanted their prayers.

"Then death struck, right and left. Cell doors were opened

and dead bodies pulled out by an arm or a leg. I wondered when it would be my father's turn and mine. Some 700 prisoners had entered that starvation period. I was one of 22 or 23 that survived, along with my father."

"The story was the same everywhere. In Montreal, Toronto, Detroit, and Chicago, soldout houses, wildly cheering audiences, and rapturous reviews greeted the Moiseyev Dance Company. When the Russian troupe opened in Detroit last week, the crowd of 5,000 at the Masonic Temple applauded more than 60 times during the whirlwind performance, then gave the dancers a standing ovation."—*News-Week*, May 26.

"There was also the matter of filth. It preoccupied everyone. To our Soviet guards, cleanliness was of little concern. A guard to whom it was, stood out as an oddity. For the most part, the guards were like the soldiers who had streamed into Dresden to rape and burn and steal.

"I spoke with eight of your countrymen,' the Yugoslav told me. 'They said they were American fliers who had been shot down by the Russians over the Baltic Sea. The Air Force has, of course, acknowledged that several B-29s and B-50s on

routine missions were downed over the Baltic. One of them told me he was afraid they would never get back to America. The Russians had reported them dead, saying there were no survivors of the crash.

"Prisoners being funneled into Vorkuta from camps in Tadzhik and Irkutsk in Soviet Asia, Omsk in Siberia, and Magadan in the Far East said there were many Americans, including veterans of the Korean War, both GIs and officers, and South Korean soldiers, working as slave laborers in their camps. From what I heard, they were PWs captured by the Communist Chinese and North Koreans who had been shipped to the Soviet for safe-keeping."

"On May 12, 1958, Mikhail Menshikov, Soviet Ambassador to the United States, spoke to the Chicago Executive Club.

"The audience of businessmen and their wives received him coolly at first, but warmed up when he belittled the idea that there was any dangerous hostility between the Soviet Union and the United States. Suggesting that the two nations were like one big happy family, Ambassador Menshikov drew an analogy from his own family.

"Admitting that there were loud arguments at his family

dinner table, Mr. Menshikov said:

"*'Yet we exist and love each other and sometimes we even cooperate with each other.'*

"*The audience laughed . . .*

"*The UP story said that the 'handsome Ambassador' has been nicknamed 'Smiling Mike,' but did not say who did the nicknaming.*" — Dan Smoot, May 26.

"The total population of the Vorkuta complex [of slave camps] lay between four and five hundred thousand working in mines, brick factories, power plants, railroad lines, streets, city and village construction, food transportation, prison help, and hospitals. According to records we were able to piece together, throughout the entire Soviet Union in mid-1954 a total of twenty-five to twenty-eight million people were held in slave-labor camps, concentration camps, secret camps for foreigners, MVD

prisons, investigation centers, MGB prisons, juvenile labor camps, and juvenile detention homes. An additional twelve million not in custody were interned in restricted areas."

In recent years, the booming Negro bass-baritone Paul Robeson "has openly identified himself with Communist-front groups. He has savagely attacked the government of the United States and has been repeatedly denied a U.S. passport for travel abroad. His destination: Russia.

"Last summer, for reasons he has not yet made clear, at the age of 59, he began to sing again — beginning in Negro churches on the West Coast. By last week, the comeback road brought him to New York and Carnegie Hall where a soldout house greeted him with a standing ovation when he walked on the stage. From then on, he could do no wrong." — *Newsweek*, May 19.

## Action 'at the grassroots'

IT is remarkable what one person can accomplish when sufficiently aroused. The story is told that after the invitation was extended by President Eisenhower a year or so ago to Tito—and the invitation was an accomplished fact—a certain patriot, a professor in a Catholic college, decided that this would not be good for America and somebody should do something about it. So he took two weeks' leave from his job, went to Washington, took a hotel room, and rented a typewriter. By night he would write speeches explaining why we should not have Tito visiting the White House, and by day he would buttonhole Senators and Congressmen, selling them on the idea of trying to stop it, and putting a speech into their hands. He got George Meany to come out publicly against the invitation. He lined up the Knights of Columbus and the American Legion. The chiefs

Our Sunday Visitor,  
July 6, 1958

of these two great organizations are said to have called on Mr. Dulles together to express the feelings of their large and influential followings.

Result? The invitation was withdrawn, and you can be sure that that one man's efforts had a great deal to do with the withdrawal.

Each of us must remember that the front line in the battle against Communism is not outer space, it is not guided missiles, it is not some remote trouble spot or underdeveloped country thousands of miles away from home. The front line is right in our own community: in our schools, our libraries, our bookstores, in every waiting room and lounge where reading matter is displayed, on the lecture platform, in our newspapers and magazines, in radio and TV. This is the battleground — and this is where we have been losing the war to Communism. The plain fact is that the Communists are winning the propaganda war in our own backyard, and it is

time we woke up and started fighting.

(Item: After Dr. Pauling's celebrated interview on "Meet the Press" in May, a letter appeared in the Pittsburgh papers deploring the "persecution" of this great scientist for his "political views." I took it on myself to answer this letter. Immediately, another person sprang to Dr. Pauling's defense. I answered that letter too. Then a third letter appeared pro-Pauling, and a fourth: "I am a Catholic but I must disagree with Father Ginder," etc. By this time I was getting tired and tempted to feel eccentric with my one-man campaign. But of all the 850,000 Catholics in the district, there was not one to give me a hand against three very able controversialists pleading the cause of darkness. I was left to fight the battle alone. "Let George do it.")

So here are a number of suggestions for the informed individual. Not all of them will be suitable in every instance, but each of you can read and evaluate them according to your own opportunities:

1. *Start an anti-Red Reading Shelf somewhere in your community.* This requires a good knowledge of anti-Communist literature, knowledge of your own community, and some

financial resources. It might best be done as a club-project. It can be a real arsenal of Americanism in your community by providing information that is available in no other way. It can be done in a big way, by renting a shop and staffing it—or it might be done in a small way by persuading your library or some accessible public agency to make available a shelf or bookcase to display and lend anti-Communist material. This project is especially valuable because so much important material is in unbound form—pamphlets, Congressional reports, etc.—which libraries are reluctant to accept, shelve, or index.

2. *Put on an anti-Communist seminar in your community.* This is the best possible way to gather a group of local patriots and to equip them with the information they need for effective anti-Communist action. It is not as expensive as you might think. In a well planned weekend, or two or three days, you could give a select group of leaders an extensive course on the most important subject of our age. Especially qualified to conduct such a seminar are Louis Budenz and Dr. Anthony Bouscaren (both of them Catholics), and Dr. Fred C. Schwartz. Pope Pius XI long ago asked the question, and

proceeded to answer it himself:

"How is it possible that such a system (as Communism), long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, We ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world? The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of Communism." A seminar such as the one just described would help remedy that complaint.

3. *If you have a good conservative, a n t i-Communist, economy-minded Congressman*, give him the grass-roots support at home in his own district which he needs if he is to be reelected. Form a non-partisan citizens' committee to back up the good work of your Congressman—also, to stiffen his backbone in favor of American interests when he gets letters and wires from the organized pro-Communists. There is a long list of fine Congressmen who have been driven from office by the pro-Communists—and the good people did not care enough to get out and save them. It is tragic how many fine men we have lost that way.

4. *Get into politics yourself on the precinct and county level*. You have to work up

from the bottom if you hope to be influential in politics. It sounds very lofty to say, "I am an independent; I vote for the man, not the party." But the man who says that has voluntarily disenfranchised himself on most of the major issues of the day. In most states, such people have no legal right to vote in a primary.

Most of the important issues in our day are decided by Republicans vs. Republicans, and Democrats vs. Democrats. As long as our Government is run by a two-party system, we have to select our party and be active in it if we want to have any influence at all in politics.

Take for example the matter of Foreign Aid. At Eric Johnston's big sales-pitch held last February 25, the country was treated to the fantastic spectacle of Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and John Foster Dulles, all seated on the same rostrum, united in happy harmony toward pouring out more billions of the taxpayers' money and, at the same time, giving the country another push toward national bankruptcy.

The only hope against such two-party connivance is increased support for the Congressmen within either party who are willing to buck their own leadership. For an inspir-

ing example of what one dedicated, informed politician can do, we need look no farther than the late Senator McCarthy, who single-handedly and even before he had a committee with him, managed to drive many pro-Communists from the State Department. In this connection, Frank S. Meyer, in a recent issue of *National Review*, wrote of "the tragic truth of politics in the United States, as in all the West, in the last forty years: the integral characteristics of the Liberalism which became increasingly predominant during those years are such that our present leadership can neither resist the infiltration of Communists within nor concert an effective strategy against Communists without.

"It was an instinctive realization of this among large sections of the American people which Senator McCarthy activated—a gnawing sense of something wrong, something which they could not define, but of which they were intuitively sure. Senator McCarthy, to be sure, did not contribute much toward definition. What he did was not done by analysis but by courage, pertinacity, and rhetorical expression of the mute and strangled common sense of millions of Americans."

Another "profile in courage" was offered by the late Senator Pat McCarran, whose monumental investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations, carried on in the teeth of egghead hostility, ended its pernicious influence on our State Department (but not, alas, before the IPR had lost China to the free world). It was also Senator McCarran who wrote the Internal Security Act.

For further inspiration and information on anti-Communist action, I would suggest

"A Handbook For Action Against Communism," by the American Mercury (250 West 57th St., New York 19, N.Y., 15c)

"Manual For American Action," by Archibald B. Roosevelt (The Alliance, 200 East 66th St., New York 21, N.Y., 50c)

"Woman's Place Is Under the Dome," by Elizabeth Churchill Brown (Human Events, 1835 K St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C., 20c)

"A Guide to Communist Action," by Dr. Anthony Bouscaren (Henry Regnery Co., 20 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill., \$4.00)

Write down each week what you have done to combat Communism. Put yourself on a schedule—the Communists do. Be a crusader with the idea of

anti-Communism. And no matter how little you may seem to accomplish, never get discouraged. Every tiny mite adds up. With fervent prayer and intelligent action I am confident that we will be able to win our battle for God and country

against the greatest enemy the Church has ever faced in the 2,000 years of its history. Remember that the principal reason why we are opposed to Communism is that it is, as Pope Pius XI declared, "essentially atheistic."

## *We couldn't face facts*

SOMETHING over ten years ago, there was a casual item in the New Yorker—it might have been titled "No Comment" — describing the trial of some poor slavey at Nuernberg. (How the Russians were fit to sit as judges in these trials when their own hands were dripping blood has never been satisfactorily explained. However—) This slavey had been a menial in the concentration camp at Auschwitz, plugging leaks in gas pipes or fixing broken windows.

Had he known what was going on? they asked. He had a general idea, yes. Why then did he co-operate? "It was the spirit of the time," he answered miserably. "I had my orders. Everyone fell in with the regime."

He was ordered hanged.

Shortly afterward, Dorothy Thompson exploded with indignation in her column because some American's record as a signer of Red petitions and a

joiner of Red fronts had been disinterred and publicized.

"Not fair!" she cried. "We must judge people by the climate of the times in which they acted. Suppose they did give moral approval to this unnatural and hideously immoral conspiracy—how are we to blame them? since everyone was doing it."

There is a thin line of rectitude that runs through the thoughts, words, and actions of humanity, dividing good from evil. It is no respecter of persons. Bishops and generals, presidents and steamfitters, nuns and housewives—all are equally concerned. And if a given proposition falls on the wrong side of that line, we are bound to resist, even to the blood if need be.

In a current film feature, "Paths of Glory," a general orders the gunner to shell their own men. The gunner rightly refuses to execute an obviously immoral order.

Such conflicts naturally come most often to the forefront in

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
July 20, 1958



a tightly disciplined establishment such as the military service. The staff can hardly encourage "private judgment" on the part of the personnel, i.e., the right of sitting in judgment on the orders of their superiors. Nevertheless, there may come a time when the soldier must remember that he is first of all a citizen and only secondarily a soldier—and act accordingly.

Suppose a company of Marines were ordered to surround the United States Capitol and arrest all Senators and Congressmen. Should they do it? (That was how the Communists took over the Russian democracy in the fall of 1917.)

General MacArthur was directed to lose a war—and when he protested, he was broken.

It was General Washington who said that "When we assumed the soldier, we did not lay aside the citizen." And at Nuernberg it was decided that obeying the order of a superior did not excuse the individual German, whether officer or enlisted man, from responsibility for his deeds.

The U.S. Military Code instructs the men to obey all *lawful* orders—hence, by implication, to disobey all unlawful orders.

With these thoughts in mind, I have sometimes pondered the

record of General Eisenhower: "He won the war for us!"

But if you ask "Why, then, did he pull his armies up outside Berlin and wait for the Russians to liberate the city?"—you get the answer, "He was told to do that and a general has to follow orders." (You think immediately of MacArthur.)

As a matter of fact, Harry Truman pointed this out in an interview last spring. When someone lauded Eisenhower's war record, Mr. Truman said simply, "He had a good commander-in-chief to give the orders."

But now they will have their cake and eat it too: "All the good things were done on Ike's own judgment, but all the bad things were done on orders from above." One must remember, however, that one may never do a bad thing, no matter what, and certain generals have suffered for that principle in its various applications and conversions: Billy Mitchell for one, MacArthur, and just recently, General Gavin.

The American public fell in love with General George S. Patton not alone because of his cavalier dash and courage, but because he was outspoken and, one sensed, honest from the ground up. He got where he was on merit and not by in-

fluence or playing the yes-man.

Frederick Ayer, Jr., a nephew of the General and an FBI agent with allied counter-intelligence forces in World War II, gives a revealing portrait of his uncle in "Yankee G-Man" (Regnery, Chicago, \$5.00). He tells of visiting General Patton in Paris on May 10, 1945. It was V-E Day. "Conversation was desultory and general," he says, "until Patton broke out with 'It's a damn tragic shame, that's what it is.' Somebody, of course, asked him what he was talking about.

"'For weeks,' he said, 'Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Austrians, and others have been coming in droves to my headquarters. They begged me to come into their countries and occupy them before the Russians got there. They told me that otherwise there would be no chance in the world for them to set up free representative governments.

"'They said, practically on their knees, with tears in their eyes, 'Come into our country now, or we are finished.' We should have done what these people asked. We could, quite morally, have torn up a few damned fool agreements and gone into all those places. [An unjust or otherwise immoral contract does not bind anyway.

Herod actually committed a mortal sin by keeping his sworn promise to Salome.] We could have said that we were doing it to save the lives of a lot of our allies still fighting on the eastern front.

"'We could have done it then, and we should do it right now.

"'Sure, it might mean a war, but the 3rd Army and 1st alone could smash them in six weeks and have very few casualties. I'm afraid that the day will come when it will take six years and cost six million American lives.'"

Ayer recalls that not long before D-Day, Patton had delivered a speech in England stating quite bluntly that it was the destiny and clear duty of the United States and Britain to reorganize and to rule the post-war world. His omission of Russia was deliberate, but nevertheless, he was quoted in the American press as having said: "It is our destiny to rule the world—we Americans and British, and of course, the Russians."

Later, he told Ayer: "Freddy, why can't we face facts? Some idiots think that if we insult the Russians they will stop fighting their invaders (the Germans). Would we quit fighting the Germans if they had driven



from the Rio Grande to Little Rock, just because some Russians had called us capitalistic dogs?"

Ayer remembers saying, "You shouldn't talk that way, Uncle George; it isn't going to make you popular."

He replied, "I'll speak in any way I see fit when I know I'm telling the truth."

"I am morally certain," Ayer continues, "that it was for these remarks that George Patton was demoted to a paper command . . ."

(After a command appearance at General Eisenhower's headquarters, Patton was relieved of his 3rd Army command and named head of the 15th Army, a "paper" Army formed to prepare a history of the war. The conference with Eisenhower followed a statement of Patton's asserting that

prevention of suffering and restoration of communications in Germany were more important than the routing out of "every single German who might be suspected of having a nazi taint."

("This nazi situation in some ways is like the Democrat and Republican fight back home," he added. "You always find the 'outs' back home making charges against the 'ins.' That's exactly what is happening here. The 'outs' are coming to me and saying the 'ins' are nazis.")

We know now that General Patton was right and the rest were wrong. Patton's was not hindsight but foresight. However, like so many other patriots of our time, he was taught a stinging lesson in the great law of survival in the Establishment: Honesty is seldom the best policy.

## *A handful of one-eared children*

IN China today there are a few dozen boys with only one ear. The Communists chopped off their other ear for listening to evil speech. They had been caught saying the rosary together. As head of world Communism, Khrushchev has never denounced this atrocity. Why should he? He quite approves of it, for he knows that there is only one force in the universe that can destroy Communism, and that is the Catholic Church.

And that is why we keep hammering at Communism. It is the only issue. Since 1945 its ironclaw has been taking souls at the rate of 5,000 per hour, day and night, year in and year out; 120,000 souls a day torn from Mass and the sacraments and thrown into slavery. *Et crescit eundo*, as we say in Latin. It gets bigger and acquires momentum as it goes along.

---

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
Aug. 31, 1958

Today is the child of yesterday. If we would understand today's headlines, we must go back to our newspaper files and visit the library.

Our troubles began when, after 15 years of quarantine and contempt from the United States, Soviet Russia was recognized by President Roosevelt in 1933. Infiltration of the Government was intensified in 1934 and continued until 1945.

Apparently the planners of the New Deal accepted Russia at face value as a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—hence, a sister democracy following a common socialist philosophy. In America, the planners were implementing a socialism approaching economic Communism, whereas Russia was under political Communism. The American planners thought that all Russia had to do was to get rid of the commissars and she would be like us; while all we had to do was to show Stalin that we were working toward

the same economic ends and convince him of our sincerity.

Actually, as Milovan Djilas has demonstrated — and Tito threw him into jail for it — European Communism is economic royalism of the worst sort, with the commissars richer and more powerful than Andrew Carnegie or John D. Rockefeller ever were.

However, this helps one understand how, after the 1940 election, the late Mr. Roosevelt could write to Norman Thomas — perennial candidate for President on the Socialist ticket: “I was amused during the campaign to think that now I am very far to the left of you.” And when, as Vice-President candidate, Mr. Truman was asked on October 17, 1944, if he welcomed the campaign support of Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, he answered that he welcomed the support of “anyone who will help keep the President in office.”

The late Robert E. Sherwood, talented playwright and ghost-writer for Mr. Roosevelt, has left us a 979-page memorandum of his associations with the top-brass of those days, and he quotes a directive written by General James H. Burns for the late Harry Hopkins. Sherwood said he was quoting it as “an excellent statement of Hopkins’

own views on the subject of relations with the Soviet Union.” (Hopkins lived at the White House.) Under Section 8 — “Suggestions for Improving Relationships” — subsections (f) through (j) read as follows:

“(f) In general, treat Russia as one of the three foremost powers in the world.

“(g) Establish the general policy throughout all U. S. departments and agencies that Russia must be considered as a real friend and be treated accordingly and that personnel must be assigned to Russian contacts that are loyal to this concept.

“(h) Work to the general plan of assisting Russia to defeat Germany, of postponing a war between Japan and Russia until Germany is defeated, and of seeking Russian assistance at the proper time as an ally be achieved, then strive to obtain her agreement to assist in the transportation of supplies into China.

“(i) Offer Russia very substantial credits on easy terms to finance her postwar rehabilitation and expansion.

“(j) Agree to assist, in every proper and friendly way, to formulate a peace that will meet Russia’s legitimate aspirations.”

(We are talking, remember, about people who approve of

cutting little boys’ ears off for listening to the rosary.)

But even before the end of World War II it was apparent that Russia was taking a new line. The Cold War had already begun and Churchill denounced Soviet Russia for it at Fulton, Missouri in 1946. Now Churchill was not one to be hooted at by the liberals. He was no OUR SUNDAY VISITOR or Charles A. Lindbergh or Herbert Hoover. He had been one of the Big Three and now, with one speech, he had pulled the rug out from under all the professors, artists, socialites, and parsons who had been induced to sign Communist petitions or join Communist front organizations.

These last were now shown up before the American community as catspaws and dupes, for public opinion reversed itself overnight. After 13 years of supping with the Devil in the guise of Red fascism, America had again found her common sense.

A further indictment of the pink “Liberals” included the fact that those who had tried to defend American interests against the Communists had all along been subjected to vitriolic contempt, derision, and wholesale character assassination. As one observer remarked, the Liberals could utter the

words “Red-baiter,” “America First,” “isolationist,” “witch-hunter,” and “book-burner” with a tone that sizzled and could count on a goodly portion of the press to parrot their mouthings. “No epithet was sulphurous enough when it came to lambasting Hamilton Fish and Martin Dies. If, by chance, some of the investigations of the Messrs. Fish and Dies had not scored 100 per cent for precision, what could the Front-joining ‘Liberals’ show for the way they spent their time?”

The country was in a slow burn that became more heated as disturbing facts began to leak out. (In our country, you can hush things up and shout them down only so long, and then something has to give.)

For instance, it came out that the national office of the Labor Relations Board had been under Communist influence. It was recalled that Mr. Roosevelt had commuted Earl Browder’s prison term “to promote American unity.” (He did not specify how it would promote American unity.) The Chicago Tribune discovered that a secret directive by the Adjutant General officially opened the way for commissioning of Communists in the United States Army.

The Daily Worker declared: “Appearing before the House

Military Affairs Committee February 27 (1945), Assistant Secretary of War McCloy and General Bissell delivered a deadly blow to the ancient Red bogey . . . They confirmed the information that the Army has removed the rule . . . that Communist opinions or affiliations should act as a bar to promotions in the Armed Forces, especially to officers' commissions and special services."

On top of all this, on September 5, 1945, Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk, had fled the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa with a quantity of papers which showed that our A-bomb had been betrayed to the Russians. The Soviet spy network extended from Canada into the United States. The Canadian Prime Minister made a special trip down to talk it over with Mr. Truman. No bulletins were issued, however, and a deep silence descended over the White House.

The Amerasia case of sum-

mer, 1945, had been another shocker: clear evidence of espionage, an open-and-shut case prepared by the FBI with 1,700 stolen Government documents recovered—and the Justice Department had practically quashed the case. On first hearing of the affair, President Truman had urged vigorous action, but he must have changed his mind later—or did someone change it for him?

As I said, Sir Winston's speech cleared the air and the fringe—"Liberals" began streaming out of the Fronts in droves. For the moment, "Liberalism" had become unfashionable. It was too close to Communism for comfort.

How could the doctrinaire "Liberals" save the situation?—and by doctrinaire, I mean those who hold "Liberalism" as a faith, who are willing to contribute and recoup some of their lost prestige?

Come around next week and I'll try to give you the answer.

## *Socialist, perhaps, but free?*

LAST week, the leaders of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania met in Pittsburgh to work up a platform. Among those present were representatives of the local Civic Club, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Americans for Democratic Action. Now everyone knows what the Civic Club stands for: more parks and playgrounds. The NAACP wants a better shake for the Negro. But the ADA is a bit more complicated.

According to Francis Biddle, Attorney General under Roosevelt and Truman and National Chairman of ADA from 1950 to 1953,

" . . . The ADA was largely founded to split from the liberal movement in America those elements of communism and fellow-travelers which . . . certainly up until 1945 did great harm to the liberal movement, by permitting with some justice, the accusation of fel-

low-travelers to be pinned on persons before the sheep and the goats had been counted."

Last week I recalled how with one speech Sir Winston Churchill had pulled the rug out from under all the professors, artists, socialites, and parsons who had been induced to sign Communist petitions or join Communist front organizations. American public opinion reversed itself overnight and the "fringe" liberals began streaming out of the fronts in droves. For the moment, liberalism had actually become unfashionable. It was too close to Communism for comfort.

How could the doctrinaire liberals save the situation?—and by doctrinaire I mean those who hold liberalism as a sort of faith. How could they recoup some of their lost prestige?

Well, philosophers of the liberal movement met in Washington in January, 1947 and organized ADA for the reasons frankly stated by Mr. Biddle as quoted above. The latest fig-

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
Sept. 7, 1958

ures show a membership of 43,000 across the country.

Since then they have worked militantly toward a planned economy in which the individual will live in a cage of "economic security" with the planners as keepers. I mean, instead of your spending your own money as you see fit, they want the State to take it and give you back what they think you should have.

Now I much prefer economic independence. In fact, I see it as our natural right. Our children have the right to an education that is not controlled by the Government. And the only man really free to criticize the State is the one who is not accepting any sort of a Government handout. When you own your own house and garden, and eat the carrots and tomatoes that you have raised in your own backyard—then you are not afraid of reprisals when you sit down and write a pointed letter to the daily paper. But if the State is at the same time your employer and schoolmaster?

I can see too that the logical extension of Foreign Aid, the most ruthlessly efficient answer of the irreligious to hunger and sickness all over the world, lies in an omnicompetent global technocracy. That would clear it up pretty well,

and it is the solution proffered by the advocates of socialism and world government. But outside of the planners, who wants it? Do you?

The Catholic answer has traditionally been the Christian Commonwealth of nations in which there is freedom of thought and education—and yet, at least in theory, no one starves because we practice the teachings of Our Lord and share with the sick and needy—freely, according to our own individual means and the grace that is given us, and not because some distant professor is dictating to us with the militia to back him up.

Characteristically, the ADA representative counseling the Pennsylvania Republicans was a professor from Carnegie Tech. He advocated a state income tax.

On the national scene, ADA has urged

1. The Brannan Plan.
2. Compulsory health insurance.
3. Federal price, wage, and rent controls.
4. Giving the President power "to modify [i.e., to raise] rates of taxes and expenditures to meet changing conditions."
5. Abolition of seniority rules in granting committee chairmanships in Congress.
6. One-sided stopping of nu-

clear testing. (In other words, we should stop the tests with no guarantees asked of other nations.)

7. Having the Federal Government finance public education rather than local districts and States.

ADA's foreign policy has taken some very peculiar twists and bends. Their 1950 statement, for instance, gave Tito a thimble-tap stating that unless Yugoslavia takes "steps in the direction of permitting free political activity by democratic parties," it cannot expect to be regarded as part of the democratic community of nations. However, "We . . . favor ample economic aid to Yugoslavia without political conditions."

Spain, though, got far more than a thimble-tap: "We unequivocally condemn the fascist regime in Spain. We are opposed to the granting of any aid to the Franco regime, whether economic, financial or military. We are opposed to the inclusion of Franco Spain in the UN or any of its subsidiary agencies, in the ERP or in the North Atlantic Pact."

(ADA did not specify how Franco is worse than Tito, or what the Communist dictatorship of Yugoslavia has to recommend it over the rather milk-and-water autarchy of Spain.)

At the same time, while opposing UN membership for Spain, ADA has urged UN membership for Communist China. Indeed, they want the United States Government to abandon our loyal ally Chiang Kai-shek and extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist gangsters who have taken over that unhappy land: "Sooner or later," said ADA in 1950, "we will be compelled to establish diplomatic relations with the Mao Tse-tung regime as the effective government of China, however much we detest its totalitarianism."

However, ADA has been so eager in its protestations of anti-Communism that they managed to fool even President Truman. At a banquet in 1954 he said that "you people in the ADA were among the first to recognize the danger of Communism here and abroad . . . You saw through the treachery of the Communists . . . You fought them at the polls, in the labor unions and in the traditional American way"—whereupon, the New York Journal-American reported, "There was a titter at or near the table where sat Libby Holman. Miss Holman fought Communism in the traditional American way by throwing a Fourth of July party for Paul Robeson at her Stamford estate in 1949.

"There was another titter at or near the table where sat Ted O. Thackrey, who fought Communism in the traditional American way as editor and publisher of The Daily Compass, a 'newspaper' that died of galloping anemia in 1952 after vociferously supporting Communist causes."

Actually, ADA has

1. Demanded repeal of the Smith Act.

2. Opposed the Mundt Bill, known since 1950 as the Internal Security Act.

3. Declared that the "recent banning of Communist student organizations on college campuses forces us to affirm most strongly the right of Communist student organizations to organize on an equal basis with other student organizations and

to hear any speaker of their choice."

4. Opposed the outlawing of any political party.

5. Fought the late Senator McCarthy by the foulest of means in his efforts to uncover Communist espionage in our Government.

But getting back to the construction of a cage in which the United States citizen will find himself well fed and adequately housed, albeit State-controlled "from cradle to grave," as they say, ADA is doing its mightiest. Since its founding in 1947 it has waged a ceaseless campaign for higher taxes, more Government regulation in every direction, more controls, expansion of Federal power over the States and individuals, and bureaucracy unlimited.

## A report suppressed

**D**URING the last 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words (700 volumes). All this talk led to 52 major agreements, and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them.

During the last three years, the United States has met 73 times at Geneva with the Chinese Reds to negotiate the release of 450 American prisoners. Not one American serviceman has been accounted for or released. The Communists are still following Stalin's principle of diplomatic intercourse:

"Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more pos-

sible than dry water or iron wood."

Lenin gave this command to his followers: "We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

On another occasion he said: "As long as capitalism remains, we cannot live in peace. At the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral Requiem will be sung over the Soviet republic or over world capitalism."

On September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

On June 2, 1957, Khrushchev appeared on our American TV screens and confidently told us: "Your grandchildren will live under Socialism."

All this and much more can be found in the Annual Re-



port of the Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives of the American Bar Association.

These learned gentlemen, our nation's attorneys, assure us that the Reds never set out for their goal in a straight line, nor even by a circuitous, winding pathway. Their motion is rather zigzag—two steps forward, one step backward, etc. This is the notorious "Communist dialect."

For example, says the Report, "The closing of the Daily Worker was a dialectical maneuver. The Communist Party made a dialectical retreat in stopping publication of the leading Party organ on January 13, 1958, under the subterfuge that it was in dire financial condition. In so doing, the Communist Party made a two-step advance. First, it strengthened the discipline of the Party because, as J. Edgar Hoover has pointed out, the internal struggle for power resulted in 'a decisive victory for the pro-Soviet faction.'

"Secondly, the ousted editor of the Daily Worker, John Gates, now performs the function of a Tito within the United States. Gates is infinitely more valuable to Communism lecturing at American colleges and universities than he ever was while with the Daily

Worker. Gatesism promotes the apathy of the intellectuals under the theme: 'Communism is dying out.' The Communists' aim is to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender.

"Also during this past year," the Report continues, "the Communists went forward with the rocks and garbage, thrown at Vice-President Nixon in South America; backward by allowing Tito to make a few anti-Soviet statements; forward with the defeats of anti-Communists in Syria and Indonesia—all with the same unity of purpose that makes everything contribute to their plan of world conquest."

According to this Committee of the American Bar Association, the major Communist tactics at the present time include:

1. *Nullification of the Smith Act and other anti-Communist laws.* The Report makes its own the opinion that recent decisions of the Supreme Court in favor of the Reds have left "the Smith Act, as to any further prosecution under it, a virtual shambles."

2. *Muzzling the FBI and Congressional investigations.* By its decision in the Watkins

case, the Supreme Court has helped the Communists here.

3. *Elimination of Federal and State security programs.* The Supreme Court has virtually emasculated these by its *Cole, Service, Slochower*, and *Sweezy* decisions.

4. *The Peace Offensive.* — "Every act that contributes to the Communist conquest is a peaceful act. If they take a gun, they take a peaceful gun, containing a peaceful bullet, and kill you peacefully, and put you in a peaceful grave. When the Chinese Communists murder millions, it is an act of peace. When the Russian tanks rolled into Budapest to butcher and destroy, it was glorious peace."

5. *Summit Conferences.* This needs no explanation. We always lose our shirt.

6. *Cultural exchanges.* A one-way street. When Americans go to Russia, they speak only through interpreters, see only what the Communists want them to see, and hear only Communist propaganda. On the other hand, Communist visitors to our country, have been given access to our industrial and agricultural know-how, as well as to some of our scientific and military installations.

7. *Recognition of Red China.* Diplomatic recognition is es-

sential to Communist subversion. The Communist espionage apparatus needs the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to set up spy centers. It needs the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spys and couriers and to receive back their reports and microfilmed documents.

8. *Halt nuclear tests.* Most experts agree that the net result would be that our country would stop testing but that, within the vast, isolated Soviet land mass, there would be circumvention of the ban on testing.

9. *East-West Trade.* This is a means of obtaining from the outside world the strategic materials with which it can arm itself for world conquest. A Senate Report on the "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials" issued July 9, 1954, shows that the Western Hemisphere contains all the 77 critical and strategic materials needed for military security. The answer to the propaganda for East-West trade is more North-South trade.

10. *Propaganda.* Communists spend \$3 billion a year on propaganda which is reaching every city and hamlet in our country. In one day, such propaganda coming through New York City alone fills three large



warehouses, and not a single piece is labeled "Communist propaganda" as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

11. *Humiliation.* This tactic has already been used by the Reds on American prisoners in Korea. Communists master-minded insulting demonstrations against Vice-President Nixon in South America which included spitting on him and pelting him with rocks and garbage. Last July 18, a mob of 100,000 Communists threw ink-bottles and stones, shattering most of the windows of our Moscow embassy. Our American Information Libraries are being burned all over the world. This summer saw nine U.S. soldiers held by East Germany, nine U.S. airmen shot down in Armenia, and 47 civilians, soldiers, and marines kidnapped in Cuba. In addition, an untold number of Americans are being held captive in the Soviet Union.

Despite the significance of its source and contents, this Report was ignored by the press,

radio, and TV, and those who wrote for a copy to the Bar Association's headquarters got back a letter from the ABA's executive director, Joseph D. Stecher, stating that "any release of this report was premature . . . copies therefore are not available for distribution."

Well, Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire has had the Report inserted in the Congressional Record, and by way of a special service to its readers, OUR SUNDAY VISITOR is cooperating with Senator Bridges in procuring its widest possible circulation. Accordingly, we will see to it that everyone writing to us gets a free copy. Simply send us a postcard with your name and address (print it in block capitals).

The Report is most informative. Although it is carefully documented and highly authoritative, it is still a gripping and most readable document. Address ABA Report, OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, Huntington, Indiana. I repeat: There is no charge.

## *Father Gillis: Isolationist*

AT the time of his death, March 14, 1957, the Paulist Father James M. Gillis was one of the most widely known and respected priests of our generation. One could scarcely say that he was beloved. Like a figure from the Old Testament, he was aloof and unbending. There was something frosty in his makeup. He was always "on his dignity." He seemed constitutionally incapable of discussing trivialities, of making "small talk." His mind seemed forever occupied with eternal principles and their application to the national and international issues of our day.

The man has become almost a legend in Catholic journalism, for Father Gillis was a publicist—radio orator, editor of *The Catholic World*, and author of a weekly column, "Sursum Corda." What distinguished him above all else was his integrity. Taking his stand on the bedrock of Aristotelian logic, he defended his principles

against all comers, even when they seemed odious and unfashionable, at considerable sacrifice to himself.

Father James F. Finley, C.S.P., has just completed a biography of his confrere, *James Gillis, Paulist*.

Now the last 20 years of Father Gillis' life were devoted to a defense of "America First." Father Finley rightly observes that "He had critics among the clergy and among the lay people, even to the last of his days.

"The critics were strong and they were sharp and, in some cases, they carried a justifiable rightness and correctness for their opinion. On some issues where James Gillis was apodictic and intransigent, he had no right to be. Some of the issues concerning world politics—the United Nations, the question of American isolation—on these things James Gillis was unmovable and unyieldingly antagonistic, and on these he was criticized seriously for being outmoded.

"This last criticism was a

*Our Sunday Visitor,*  
Oct. 26, 1958

little bit of the truth—or, as the strongest opponents of James Gillis saw it, a lot of the truth.”

It is on that precise point that I would take issue with Father Finley. Every passing day brings still further proof that Father Gillis was overwhelmingly right in practically every phrase and sentence that he wrote. This column does not have the space to discuss every issue on which Father Gillis was controverted, but let us take the one matter of “isolationism,” by which I take it Father Finley means the policy of neutrality as regards World War II.

Most of us were neutralist during the 30's. The last Gallup Poll before Pearl Harbor showed 80% of the people opposed to intervention in Europe, and a voluntary enlistment program sponsored before the enactment of the draft act of 1940 was a washout. Only 9,000 men had enlisted after a six-weeks' campaign.

On the eve of election in 1936, Mr. Roosevelt made a speech at Chautauqua, New York, in which he said:

“We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations . . .

“We are not isolationists except in so far as we seek to isolate ourselves from war . . .

“I have seen war . . . I hate war.”

Father Gillis liked that speech and he plugged for Roosevelt in that campaign. But Mr. Roosevelt changed within a short time, as indicated by his “quarantine the aggressors” speech at Chicago on October 5, 1937. He had become convinced, now, that the doctrine of neutrality was somehow an ignoble thing and it should be abandoned in favor of the new theory of collective warfare against an aggressor nation. Actually, he was beginning to base his policy on a supposed friendship and not upon the national interest of our country. “In power politics, there are no friendships; there are only interests.”

This new concept of collective security rested on a blend of faith, emotion, and hypothesis. The public were told that Hitler was preparing to attack the United States. First he would conquer the rest of the world, then he would consolidate his resources and finish us off. A variant had it that he would strangle us economically by embargo or boycott.

But our armed forces later captured literally tons of material from the official Nazi ar-

chives and these were carefully sifted through in preparation for the Nuernberg trials. There was not one word, not the least hint of a plan to move against the United States.

However, such scare stories could not be refuted at the time, and so they gained wide acceptance.

Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt himself acknowledged that “There can be no question that the people of the United States in 1939 were determined to remain neutral in fact and in deed . . .”

Mr. Frederic R. Sanborn, international lawyer and contemporary historian explains that

“As a whole, the American people had never accepted the new scholastic theory of more or less ‘collective’ warfare against an alleged aggressor. Perhaps the people’s intuitive common sense had already suggested to them that in any future ‘collective’ action the other nations would expect America to assume almost the entire burden involved. Perhaps they esteemed the wise advice of George Washington more highly than the new theory. But apart from such conjectures it is clear that they believed in our established policy of neutrality.

“Semantic propagandists

have tried to belittle that doctrine by calling it what they hoped would be a smearing name — ‘isolationism.’ Name calling is not intelligent or rational and this device of propaganda did not deceive the majority of the American people who continued to be ‘isolationist’ in their desire to remain neutral and to live in peace, as every poll of public opinion conclusively showed. Their general disillusionment was, in fact, due to their ultimate realization that Mr. Roosevelt in some unperceived way, and at some unknown time, had abandoned his professed policies of neutrality and peace and had secretly adopted a design for war.”

Although the President spoke of “methods short of war” in his annual message to Congress, January 4, 1939; although, a few months later, he told the Senate Military Affairs Committee that our frontier in the battle against Fascism was on the Rhine; although our first peace-time conscription act was passed September 16, 1940, his pledges to maintain peace flowed constantly during the campaign for a third term:

“I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any for-

eign wars."—Boston, October 30.

"I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars. And I will keep on fighting."—Brooklyn, November 1.

"Your President says this country is not going to war."—Buffalo, November 2.

But by now Father Gillis was fighting the third term tooth and nail.

Now to strike a balance on interventionism (I am using the summary compiled by William Henry Chamberlin and Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes):

"American security has not been assured; rather, it is much more precarious than in 1941. Russian power is far greater than that of Germany and Japan combined. The balance of power was destroyed in Europe, and the United States is now spending untold billions in a hopeless effort to restore it. In

the Far East, Russia has superseded Japan as the dominant power and Japan has been rendered helpless as a checkmate against Russian advances. The Chinese Communists have taken over China.

"Our economic security is menaced by debt, unparalleled inflation, near-confiscatory taxes, and the prospect of astronomical future expenditures in a probably futile effort to regain the international security we already enjoyed at the time of Pearl Harbor," says Dr. Barnes. "Individual security is menaced by our unstable economy, by unprecedented inroads upon our civil liberties and personal rights and by the specter of universal military training and interminable war hazards."

Father Gillis was always a dedicated isolationist. Was he right or was he wrong?

## The historical blackout

TRUTH is always the first casualty in time of war. As a child growing up after World War I, I can remember being chilled with horror at tales of how the "Hun" had crucified Belgian women on their own kitchendoors, how they had chopped off the hands of little French boys so that they would never bear arms against Germany. We were told that they cooked up the bodies of their dead to make soap and fertilizers.

Governments consider such atrocity stories a fair means of building hatred in their people against the enemy and thus speeding up the war effort. But as soon as the war is over and tempers have cooled, the historians get to work at setting the record straight for posterity. All the lies are swept out the door and truth comes into her own once more.

Thus, Sir Arthur Ponsonby's *Falsehood in Wartime* and J. M. Read's *Atrocity Propagan-*

*da*, J. S. Ewart's *Roots and Causes of the War*, and *Genesis of the World War* by Professor Harry Elmer Barnes. At the same time, our more scholarly periodicals featured a spate of articles sifting through all the aspects of the war, ignoble as well as noble. (I am speaking here of World War I.)

The process is known in historical circles as "revisionism," for in the mid-1920's it was thought that a fresh evaluation of the guilt for World War I might lead to a revision of the Versailles Treaty. If only it had!

World War II presented an even greater challenge to the historian. The four years between President Roosevelt's Chicago Bridge Speech and Pearl Harbor were filled with passionate and often angry debate on neutrality vs. interventionism. But with Pearl Harbor, the neutralists were silenced "in the interests of national unity" and the interventionists had the field to themselves.

*Our Sunday Visitor*,  
Nov. 2, 1958

Then came peace, after a fashion. But when the neutralists came forward with footnotes and corrections in the "court history" of the previous four years, they found themselves baffled by a conspiracy of various elements.

As summarized by Dr. Harry Barnes, a principal victim of the plot, there are four techniques in use:

1. *Public documents are being kept bottled up from all but the official and court historians.* The Rockefeller Foundation has even admitted subsidizing certain historians to anticipate or frustrate revisionists, to prevent what they call "the debunking journalistic campaign" following World War I.

Says Dr. Charles Austin Beard: "They hope that, among other things, the policies and measures of Franklin D. Roosevelt will escape in the coming years the critical analysis, evaluation and exposition that befell the policies and measures of Woodrow Wilson and the Entente Allies after World War I."

But this is a long step toward the 1984 of George Orwell. As stated by the editor of the London Times Literary Supplement, "Once the principle is accepted that governments grant access to their archives to certain chosen historians and

refuse it to others, it would be unrealistic to ignore the temptation that may arise in the future to let the choice fall on historians who are most likely to share the official view of the moment and to yield readily to discreet official promptings as to what is suitable, and what is unsuitable, for publication. When this happens, the last barrier on the road to 'official history' will have fallen."

But that is precisely what has already happened in the United States, and we already have an official mythology "in possession," canonized and inviolate beyond correction. When two members of the historical staff of the Department of State ventured recently to protest against the censorship of public documents, of the two, Dr. Bryton Barron was forced without pay into premature retirement, and Dr. Donald Dozer was fired (cf. Barron's *Inside the State Department*, Comet Press, New York, 1956, \$3.00).

2. *Revisionist historians cannot find a publisher.* Not a single major publisher has issued a revisionist book since 1945, despite the fact that manuscripts were presented by such hitherto recognized scholars as Dr. Barnes, Dr. Charles Austin Beard, Dr. Charles Callan Tansill, Frederic R. San-

born, William Henry Chamberlin, John T. Flynn, and many others.

Leading members of two of the largest publishing houses in the country have told Dr. Barnes that, whatever their personal feelings, they would not consider it ethical to endanger their business and the investment of their stockholders by publishing books critical of American foreign policy since 1937.

Their reasons: The book clubs and the main sales outlets for books are controlled by powerful pressure groups opposed to truth on such matters. These outlets not only refuse to market revisionist books, but they also threaten to boycott other books by those publishers who might defy their blackout ultimatum.

Only two relatively small firms have ventured to publish revisionist history: the Devin-Adair Co. of New York and the Henry Regnery Co. of Chicago.

3. *Revisionist books are ignored or obscured.* They are most commonly given the "silent treatment," i.e. they are not reviewed at all. For example, Frederic R. Sanborn's devastating *Design for War* was totally ignored by Time, Newsweek, the New Yorker, the Nation, the New Republic, Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly,

and the Saturday Review of Literature. Time, Newsweek, the Atlantic and Harper's likewise ignored Dr. Tansill's *Back Door to War*.

4. *Such books are smeared, together with their authors.* When forced to review such a book the New York Times, for instance, maintains a staff of hatchetmen (Otto D. Tolischus, Drew Middleton, et al.) ready to call any such book "bitterly partisan," written in a state of "blind anger" with "unusual asperity." A string of like-minded college professors stand by in case greater prestige is needed to destroy the book — men like Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Henry Steele Commager.

If the facts cannot be shouted down, the regular alternative is to smear the author, who thereupon becomes an "isolationist" undoubtedly in the pay of the Chicago Tribune.

The liberals have been interventionist since 1937 at the latest. Hence, any change in the official mythology could only undermine their reputation of infallibility with their readers, for the very fulcrum of the issue is a realistic evaluation of the causes behind World War II and the policies that prolonged it and brought about the Cold War.

Readers of this column so

often express their astonishment at the facts I have disclosed: "This is all new to us," "We had no idea . . .," "Why didn't someone tell us these things?" It is because of the historical blackout.

Nevertheless, most of the facts are on record. Buy, beg, or borrow, if you can, a copy of *Perpetual War for Perpetual*

*Peace*, edited by Harry Elmer Barnes (Caxton Press, Caldwell, Idaho, 1958, \$6.00). Then write for a list of their publications to the Devin-Adair Co., 23 E. 26 St., New York 10, N.Y., and the Henry Regnery Co., 20 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill.

They will supply you with plenty to think about.

## *The N.C.E.C. and its aims*

IN the letters column of Sept. 28, Father Juniper Carol, O.F.M. asked that I present some facts on the National Committee for an Effective Congress, of which Mr. Edward S. Skillin, editor of *The Commonwealth*, is a member.

On Dec. 30, 1955, Senator Jenner of Indiana stated that "The NCEC has operated over the last eight years giving research assistance and funds to those members of Congress who support the measures leading to a collectivist welfare state at home, and a collectivist one world in foreign policy."

Their own literature advertizes that "The NCEC is the only channel through which public spirited citizens can give direct, practical support to responsible candidates of both parties in a manner that frees the candidates from the necessity of making unwarranted commitments, or otherwise entangling their independence."

In other words, dear reader,

*Our Sunday Visitor*,  
Nov. 16, 1958

their independence is not to be entangled by any such considerations as the wishes of the citizens who voted them into office. Thus they are left free to push the program of the NCEC.

"The NCEC," to continue from their literature, "also works to improve public understanding of congressional events through publication of the newsletter, congressional report, and preparation of special background material for members of the press and other key opinion-formers."

(This last is known as "brainwashing the public.")

Senator Jenner denounced them as "a part of the 'apparatus' which is working to bring about in this country a single monolithic party, directed and managed from above, but presented to the people behind two different masks, one labeled 'Democratic' and the other labeled 'Republican,' but both forced by this hidden minority to move ever farther to the left."

According to the Senator

from Indiana, "The plan is to name leftwing candidates in both parties in key districts, so that the voters will be confronted with Hobson's choice between two leftwing candidates with different labels. Whether the voters vote for a leftwing candidate, or stay at home, a minority will have won control of the district and an important advantage in control of the next Congress."

In summary, "What we are confronted with here," says Senator Jenner, "is something more than a leftwing bloc trying to elect a handful of leftwing Congressmen. This is a carefully designed strategic program for the subversion of the Congress and of the legislative power. If the Committee succeeds in its aims, the Congress will represent a militant leftwing minority group. The American people will be helpless."

On July 23, 1954, the NCEC sent a telegram to every member of the Senate, asking for support of measures that would choke off all Congressional investigation of Communism.

In fact, so strongly did it feel about the threat to Communists in Government that it contributed a total of \$73,372 to the censure of the late Senator McCarthy. This was disclosed in a report made under the require-

ments of the Corrupt Practices Act.

According to the Chicago Tribune (Oct. 28, 1954), the NCEC set up headquarters near the Senate Office Building with a high powered press agent who spent much time in Flanders' office. (It was Senator Flanders who sponsored the motion against McCarthy.) According to Fulton Lewis, Jr. (July 26, 1954), this press agent spent so much time with Senator Flanders that reporters and employees mistook him for a new member of the Senator's staff.

The financial report of the NCEC showed contributions of \$78,909 to the organization in the period between Nov. 7, 1953 and Sept. 8, 1954. The financial backing of the lobbying group came mainly from New York City and Hollywood. Among the contributors listed were Laird Bell of Chicago (\$1,000) and Marshall Field of Chicago (\$600). Field previously had donated \$2,000 and Mr. & Mrs. Bell, \$1,450.

A contribution of \$950 came from Mr. & Mrs. Max Ascoli, publisher of the *Reporter Magazine*, which specialized in attacks on McCarthy.

Former Senator William Benton (D., Conn.), who once sought to expel McCarthy from the Senate, gave \$350.

Contributions from Cali-

fornia included Paul Hoffman, economic co-operation administrator under Truman and currently chairman of the Studebaker Corp., \$1,000; J. D. Shane, \$1,000; Paul Helms, wealthy Los Angeles baker and a golfing companion of President Eisenhower, \$1,000; and Samuel Goldwyn, \$1,000.

The American Legion recently issued a fact-sheet on the National Committee for an Effective Congress. Together with the Catholic Church and the F.B.I., it has been said that the American Legion is the most aggressively anti-Communist group in the United States. They have a passionate interest in the welfare of our country. Many of the members follow the affairs of the Legion from sickbeds and wheelchairs in Veterans Hospitals all over the land. Their blood has consecrated the soil of Europe and Asia from Omaha Beach and Anzio to Bastogne and Hurtgen Forest, and from Iwo Jima to Korea. Their buddies lie enfolded in the blue waters of Pearl Harbor. They bore arms for you and for me. They are intensely sincere, and it is their considered judgment that:

"In view of the record of some of the members of the NCEC and because of its opposition to Congressional investigations, this organization is not

one which patriotic citizens would care to support."

Let us examine the records of some of the membership of the NCEC:

George Backer is listed as a member of the National Executive Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy. (See House Un-American Activities report, Appendix IX, 1944, p. 381) and as a sponsor of the Federal Arts Council and Workers Alliance. (See HUAC, Appendix IX, 1944, p. 1547.)

Stringfellow Barr is reported as the signer of an appeal sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties for the dismissal of charges against Sam Adams Darcy, Communist leader in California. (See HUAC, Appendix IX, 1944, p. 1235.) He is also listed as a sponsor of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill. (See Report of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, HUAC, 1950, p. 11.)

Telford Taylor has been retained as a counsel for the leftwing labor leader Harry Bridges, whom the American Legion has opposed for 20 years. (See Cong. Record, 7/30/54, p. 12122.)

Michael Straight is the President of the William C. Whitney Foundation, which has made at least 20 grants to pro-Communist causes. (See Tax Exempt



Foundations Hearings Before the Select Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, 1952, p. 430.) Straight is also listed as a member of the National Advisory Board of Indusco, Inc. (See Institute of Pacific Relations, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1952, p. 3794.)

Gardner Jackson's 23 affiliations with Communist front and subversive organizations include that of trusteeship in the Robert Marshall Foundation (see HUAC, Appendix IX, 1944, p. 1560) and affiliation with the International Labor Defense (see Special Report on Subversive Activities Aimed at Destroying Our Representative Form of Government, Special

Committee on Un-American Activities, 1942, p. 11).

Arthur M. Schlesinger's extensive affiliations include membership in both the National Citizens' Political Action Committee (see HUAC, Appendix IX, 1944, p. 265) and in the National Committee of the American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy (see Investigation of Un-American Propaganda in the U. S., Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 1938, p. 569).

Henry Seidel Canby's record includes sponsorship of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (see HUAC, Appendix IX, 1944, p. 941) and the American Pushkin Committee (see HUAC, Appendix IX, page 1772).

## A sense of foreboding

IN the light of the recent elections, it is interesting to recall the reports syndicated last September in the Scripps-Howard papers by Samuel Lubell after a tour of the country. Beneath an exterior of material prosperity — fresh-painted houses, two-car families, backyard swimming pools — he found a deep uneasiness.

"This uneasiness has a curious quality," he wrote. "It is not a fretting over something that has already happened. Mainly it reflects an anxiety over impending disaster, a sense that as a nation we are beset by problems which are slipping beyond our control.

"Sometimes it is the segregation struggle. People ask, 'Where will it end?' At other times it is the continued rise in taxes or living costs that voters point to and demand, 'When will someone do something about that?'

"But the deepest concerns are voiced over the trend of

events abroad. Again and again in recent weeks people have begun by saying that 'those islands off China are worthless' and then have added, 'But we can't give them up. We have to take a stand somewhere.'

"In short, on a surprisingly wide range of problems, much of the public has the feeling that 'we're being backed into a corner we can't get out of.'"

Looking out on the world from his farm in Maryland, as reported in this paper several weeks ago, Whittaker Chambers believes that Christendom has lost its last battle. We might as well throw in the towel, he says. The Communists have already mastered the globe. It only remains for them to mop up the few remaining pockets of resistance.

For that precise reason, a third World War does not seem to fit into the picture. Russia is slowly jockeying us into a position where, as a Committee of the American Bar Association has put it, we shall be

given a sort of Hobson's choice between surrender or annihilation.

The people are crying for leadership and there is none. Too few of our elected representatives are convinced of the absolute evil of Communism.

In a passionately sincere oration delivered last summer at Wellesley, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek damned the putative "intellectuals" of the world for creating popular apathy toward the demon of Communism and destroying the popular will to resist. Because of too much intellectual hand-wringing over the horrors of modern war, "freedom and the values of human dignity, which we were taught to cherish above all else, have begun to be secondary to biological survival."

"It is a tragedy," she said, "that some powerful minds have allowed themselves to be enmeshed in arguments over means such as relaxation of tension, appeasement, and finally slavery-better-than-annihilation, groveling in the hopeless hope that life would be spared them.

"These intellectuals . . . confuse the need for peace with survival at any cost.

"They nullify and perhaps unwittingly desecrate the principle of human dignity which

has been the motivating force against tyranny.

"They are ignoring the fact that if total darkness should fall upon the world, it would be they who have made the Communist conquest possible by destroying the will to fight. They would be achieving what Communist imperialism could never have hoped to achieve if the will to stand firm had been kept high."

Regarding the apathy of the "intellectuals," compare their response to the Hungarian revolt of 1956 with their reaction to the Spanish Civil War. Feelings are still bitter against Franco in these circles, while their outrage at the Budapest massacre subsided within a period of days.

The difference is, of course, that the so-called Spanish Loyalists were fighting Fascism, whereas the Hungarian Freedom Fighters were fighting Communism. It does make a difference, you see!

Commenting on the difference in attitude of the "intellectuals" toward Fascism and Communism, Diana Trilling wrote last June in the New York Herald-Tribune —

"Our supposedly enlightened classes in this country still make a quite automatic and unconscious distinction between

Fascism and Communism; Fascism they think of as an out and out enemy of democracy, Communism they regard as something with which democracy has cautiously to come to terms. After all," she wrote, "it is the same people who are most vocal in protest against aid to Franco or even against travel in Spain who are most eager in support of aid to the iron curtain countries or of cultural exchange with the Soviet Union!"

Renouncing any imputation of outright Communism on the part of such intellectuals, Miss Trilling nevertheless points out that "usually quite without knowing it, they have derived their basic moral-political criteria from what is still presented to us as the Soviet idealism. For several decades now, and not alone in America but throughout the world, it has been in identification with the proclaimed moral objectives of Communism that democratic opinion, at its top level of education and conscience, has defined its own idealism, and sought confirmation of its own morality."

But the cold war and even this present period of co-existence have considerably shaken the faith in the Communist "idealism" of many people who once, however unwittingly, took their chief moral leader-

ship from the Soviet Union or its propagandists. Now it is perhaps as a result of this loss of guidance that American intellectuals are so apathetic about foreign affairs.

"No longer able to believe that whatever the Soviet Union wants must be morally right and whatever capitalism demands for its own protection must be wrong, but not yet prepared to repose their full faith in democracy," says Miss Trilling, "our idealistic classes are in the position of not having any moral position at all. Their present political passivity may indeed reflect a persisting reluctance to confront the reality of Russian totalitarianism in its totality. But it also reflects their sense of impotence in having been robbed of moral directive and of the subtle authority which the Soviet image once exercised over their moral-intellectual lives."

Since the Government draws its personnel largely from these very intellectuals who are now disillusioned and morally impotent, it is bound to reflect their cultural-political background. Hence the official loathing for a Senator intent only on searching out treason in Government, an attitude projected across the nation with terrifying efficiency. Hence also our do-nothing attitude when faced

with the revolt in East Berlin. Again, the State of Israel had not been proclaimed three hours before Harry Truman recognized it in the name of the United States, and yet the Free Government of Hungary stood on its own feet for at least three days while President Eisenhower nervously looked the other way.

Miss Trilling also cites the absence of an announced moral principle in relation to the Indonesian rebellion, the reluctance of our Government to pass judgment on the Sukarno regime, our attitude of childish innocence in the Suez crisis, our bungling in North Africa: "Surely," says Miss Trilling, "it is no accident of culture that, in all of these emergencies, wherever America has landed is exactly where the Soviet Union could have wished us to land."

Woven deep into the fabric of our contemporary political morality, so deep that we have forgotten its sources, she con-

cludes, is the need to minimize or blink or extenuate the Soviet reality, while holding ourselves and democracy to maximum account for every conceivable culpability or indiscretion.

"Thus thrown off our moral balance and clouded in our judgment of simple political rights and wrongs, as a Government we shilly-shally and miss opportunity after opportunity for the forthright assertion of our democratic will."

\* \* \*

We read now of a proposed alteration in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "the better to reflect the progressive spirit of the day." Namely: "We pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United Nations, and to the People's Democracy for which it stands, One World, under Reason, egalitarian, with social and economic adjustment for All."—Thank God, it's only a joke cooked up by three Yale undergraduates.

IMMACULATA BOOKSTORE & LIBRARY  
238 WOODBINE STREET  
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY 40203  
(502) 635-7073 • (502) 635-7083